# THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 5.

JULY, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
82, 84 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Forum

JULY, 1901.

# A PLEA FOR THE INTEGRITY OF CHINA.

THERE has been recently manifested, among the powers forming the international convention, a disposition to pursue a policy of mild retrenchment in their dealings with China. It is true that this tendency has evoked a more or less denunciatory protest from Russia, whose attitude of rigorous harshness and exorbitant demands has been the one disturbing element in the concert. This attitude is all the more remarkable, since it contrasts so sharply with Russia's first policy of posing as the champion of China, and, in the initial discussions of the international convention, of urging a course of unparalleled mildness in subsequent relations with that empire. But to any one familiar with the subtle elements of Russian diplomacy the reasons governing this abrupt "about face" are not difficult to appreciate. The impassioned warning sent in March to Li Hung Chang, by M. de Giers, the Russian minister to Pekin, each word of which was freighted with the evidence of defeated ambition, has, or should have, shown to the interested powers that no faith can be safely placed in Russian official asseverations when interests which are solely and distinctively Russian are not served.

Russia has often complained that injustice has been done her by the Western nations who have been willing enough to believe the statements of England, Russia's arch-enemy, that the plighted word of the Russian government is not to be trusted. It is difficult, however, to see how Russia can palliate or explain away her radical and widely varying policies of almost absurd weakness and stern demands in the Chinese muddle; and it cannot be denied that she has only herself to blame if a

*Permission to republish articles is reserved.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrong construction has been popularly placed on the motives governing her negotiations. Nor need it cause surprise that her suspicious change of front, when defeated for the time in her Manchurian ambitions, is generally construed as an evidence that she has been playing a reprehensible double game with the allied powers for months past. If "by their fruits ye shall know them," then Russia has offered a masterpiece of diplomatic insincerity for the world's inspection.

All this is somewhat apart from the subject in hand; but it is of interest as showing that the coldness manifested by the international convention toward gratifying private revenge presages a milder and less coercive policy toward China. This more enlightened policy carries with it something of poetic justice. If in the first shock of indignation against China her complete subjugation and humiliation were the only objects sought, the lapse of time, bringing with it cool, sober-minded judgment, has led to a better understanding of the goading causes that provoked her militant defiance of the world, and a unanimous belief among all fair-minded critics that she has not been totally at fault. In fact, strive as we may to justify their existence, there are some things to be laid at the door of our vaunted civilization which do not show to advantage when considered without bias or blind partisanship. A proper appreciation of this fact will lead to a better understanding of what is to follow. Although, in dealing with the question of China, I write from the point of view of a friend of that nation, I do not wish it to be inferred that I am specially circumstanced in seeing the question merely from a Chinese standpoint.

The present state of China is suggestive of the Chinese puzzle, which, when it has been pulled to pieces, has to be put together again. At the outset a general disposition was shown among the interested powers to tear apart and scatter the pieces of China with a frenzied zeal which has only been equalled by their subsequent activity to reassemble these pieces and patch them together into some resemblance to the original. But, unfortunately, this satisfactory result has been rendered somewhat difficult from the fact that in the transition some of the pieces seem to have got lost. One thing is plain, namely, that an exhibition of Christian civilization has been given which has been unexampled before. In the process of separating and putting together again, Russia has managed to appropriate a little piece on one side, and a large piece on the other; England has a piece, Germany has a piece, France has a piece; and while the United States has not shown a lust of territory, she demands the maintenance of an "open door" in China, unmindful of the fact that she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is slamming her own door in the face of the world. In all this sorry business the fact that some degree of justice entitles China's own views to consideration has been lost sight of in the policy of each for himself, seize what you can get, and the devil take the hindmost. Yet it might not be inapt to suggest, if the traditional methods of civilized procedure are to be followed, that China's own views are those entitled to chief recognition, even if it may not have occurred that the cry of "China for the Chinese" is not, after all, very different from the cries of "America for the Americans," "France for Frenchmen," "Germany for Germans," and "Russia for Russians."

Now that the motives governing, and the conditions leading up to, the Boxer outbreak of last summer may be viewed in a dispassionate retrospect, it is possible to gain a fuller and more satisfactory explanation of the fundamental causes of the tumultuary convulsion which roused the world, and which has made the political situation in China the point of white-heat interest. The origin of the Boxer movement has been ascribed to different causes. In turn, the abuse by missionaries of the privileges accorded them by the Chinese government, official jealousy of Christian proselytism, and the behavior of foreign nations in their treatment of China through their diplomatic representatives have been advanced as having an important bearing on the situation. It is to no one of these reasons, but rather to their combination, along with other disturbing causes of a secondary character, and the universal Chinese belief that the civilized powers are bent on the vivisection of their country, that may be attributed the truculent outbreak of the Boxers and the deep-rooted aversion of the Chinese to alien influences. The position of the Chinese is not difficult to understand, and their attitude is in nowise dissimilar from that which would be adopted by any other nation or individual person similarly circumstanced. If one had introduced a guest into one's house, and if, profiting by this advantage, that guest had manifested a disposition to appropriate one's property and personal belongings and to transgress all ethics of hospitality, one could be excused if outraged indignation prompted the turning out of that guest, neck and heels. The feelings which would govern an individual are but similar to those which have actuated China as a nation, and have prompted her to a policy for which she is now suffering political chastisement by the might that makes right.

To appreciate China's view of the situation and her full belief in the justice of her claims, it is necessary to review the sequence of events of which the Boxer outbreak was but the culminating point. To reach the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

root of the question it would be necessary to go back to the initial concerted action which breached the wall of Chinese exclusiveness and antipathy to foreigners; but, for the question in hand, it is only necessary to antedate the present crisis by a few years, and recur to the assault made on Chinese integrity in 1897. Mention has been made already of the filching of small pieces of territory from China. The first movement of this kind, for which the German nation is responsible, occurred in November of that year, and consisted of the leasing or annexation, apparently synonymous terms, of the region opposite Japan, known as Kiaochoo. The place of itself was of no great commercial or strategical importance at the time, although the Chinese government had planned to build there a series of naval docks and shipyards, and to widen and improve the harbor. In the eager greed of commerce, there had been between the various nations of Europe and the United States a keen competition for getting what are called "markets" in China. Among strictly civilized nations, a trade intercourse of this character, even between the most strenuous commercial rivals, might be carried on for years, and perhaps centuries, without untoward conditions injecting themselves into the situation. Such conditions would not have developed in China, if at the very outset the diplomatic insincerity of the civilized powers had not been revealed in their thinly veiled attempts on China's territorial integrity. The *dénouement* was sudden, but not altogether unexpected. Germany was the first power to profit by it.

In November, 1897, two German missionaries were murdered in the vicinity of Kiaochoo Bay. Germany, seeing in this event an opportunity to steal a march upon her commercial rivals, by seizing upon it to her own advantage, made it the base upon which to erect demands, which, between two civilized powers, would have been looked upon as almost farcically outrageous and exorbitant, when the claim on which they were founded was taken into consideration. For this injury to German pride, Germany demanded the degradation of several important Chinese officials, although there was no evidence that the Chinese government had had anything to do with the outrage of which Germany complained; the erection of three churches at the cost of the Chinese government; and an indemnity to be paid to the families of the murdered missionaries. The latter demand was a just one, and received the sanction of the Chinese government. However, as the churches, which have been wittily termed by one supporter of China "Churches of the Holy Indemnity," were to cost 60,000 taels, and as the total indemnity would thus figure up to the respectable figure of $160,000, the Chinese government naturally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

showed considerable hesitation in immediately acquiescing in such an unwarrantable demand.

Accordingly, Germany, determined to risk all at one throw of the dice, instead of lessening the amount of her claims, added a rider securing to herself in preference to her commercial rivals the important advantage of bidding for the construction and maintenance of a railroad, if one should be required in that province. As an earnest of her intention to have these claims satisfied, without following the usual course of diplomatic procedure, with a suspicious promptness, and in defiance of all the ethics of international relations, she seized upon the port of Kiaochoo, expelled the Chinese commandant and other Chinese officials, and announced her intention of holding what she had seized until the demands which she had made had been settled. The vacillating Chinese government agreed to these demands. Germany was informed that they would be paid, and that full reparation would be made for the murder of the missionaries. But, instead of keeping her pledge to China that Kiaochoo would be evacuated when this concession was made, Germany followed up her first high-handed proceeding by a diplomatic manœuvre which was worthy of the Middle Ages and for which there is no apology. Her demands were renewed, and this time she coolly asked that a guarantee should be given for the future. Nor was this the most insulting part of the proposition, as she specifically named what this compensatory safeguard should be, namely, the leasing of Kiaochoo Bay to Germany for a period of ninety-nine years, which was diplomatic language for the permanent territorial cession to Germany of Chinese soil. All this, it should be remembered, was the fair reparation, according to German belief, for the murder of two missionaries. A few hundred such convenient martyrs and the whole world would be in pawn to the Teuton!

Seeing the fruitful rewards of an energetic policy of bluff and coercion, and somewhat concerned lest, if she deferred action, her own share of the proceeds might be infinitesimal, Russia now took a hand in the game. In repeated protestations to the Chinese government she strove to show that, with Germany so favored, Russia should be given some territory by way of what she was pleased to call reparation or compensation. Bewildered by this new demand from an unexpected quarter, the Chinese government again showed a natural hesitation. Russia adopted practically the same policy as that pursued by Germany; laying sufficient stress upon her urgent "requests" to show that she was determined to see them fulfilled. Yielding to Russian influence, which is believed to be paramount in Pekin, and unwilling to arouse open antagonism, which might

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be manifested, and, indeed, has actually been manifested since, on the Manchurian border, China, despite the protests of Japan, followed the easiest road out of the difficulty, and agreed to all that Russia demanded. Thus, without any reciprocal return, and without even the shallow substance upon which Germany had based her claims, Russia, at no greater inconvenience than a bullying policy of diplomatic coercion, secured Port Arthur and Talienwan under a lease of twenty-five years, with the even more valuable concessions of a right to run a railroad down from the north to these places, and to have this railroad guarded by Russian troops.

England, who had looked with disfavor on Germany's political juggling, and at the time had loudly protested against it, was electrified when the Russian demands were consummated, only a few weeks after the Kiaochoo affair. She could look upon the success of Germany with no more concern than at the prosperity of a commercial rival. In the case of Russia it was different. By the demands of Russia and their gratification she was hard hit, inasmuch as they marked one further step in Russian expansion, and a further strengthening of the forces of the hereditary Slavonic antagonist who is to dispute with her the political and commercial supremacy of Asia. The British government at once filed the most urgent protests against the granting of such powerful advantages to Russia. Lord Salisbury pointed out that the leasing of Port Arthur gave Russia a dominating authority in the councils of Pekin, and that it was unnecessary, inasmuch as Russia was co-terminous with China all through the north, and thus possessed as much power and influence with the Chinese court as she could really and reasonably expect. But, having the consent of China, and furthermore holding actual possession of her grant, Russia enjoyed the advantage which constitutes nine points of the law, and could well afford to snap her fingers at this disgruntled ebullition of diplomatic wrath in an opponent whom she designed to humble.

Seeing that there was no chance of dislodging Russia from her position of vantage, it was now necessary for England to safeguard her own interests and repair the damage by making a counter demand. The Chinese government, overruled by the dangerous precedents which by sheer, brutal, unrighteous force she had been compelled to establish, could find no satisfactory excuse to raise against this new demand; so without any trouble England secured the harbor of Weihaiwei, which shared to some extent the advantages of Port Arthur. Its strategic value was less than that of Port Arthur. It had no considerable docks or naval stations, and a large force would be required to defend it. But as no better prize was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

left in the bag, England was, perforce, content with her acquisition. She had at least gained some advantage to check the complete success of her Slavonic rival. It may be urged, judging from our American standpoint, that England's motives are altruistic. She has never arrogated the right to enjoy in any part of her territory commercial advantages beyond those she has been willing to accord to other nations. Her absolute unselfishness in this respect is notorious; while with Russia and Germany, whose aims are distinctively national, there is a tendency to safeguard Russian and German interests, respectively, to the exclusion of all others. China, too, has less to fear from any British demands which are made upon her. In dealing with this subject, however, it is the principle of the thing which must be considered. England demands, or, if it will suit diplomatic usage better, let us say "requests," possession of Weihaiwei, without rendering an equivalent. China, in reality unwilling to do so, grants this claim, being governed by the same reasons which have led her to accede to the claims of Germany and Russia. In fact, she fears to antagonize the maker of this third demand. Her gift of a slice of her territory has not been gratuitous and of her own volition, but has been wrested from her by force, even if that force has been encased in a glove of diplomatic courtesy.

We may pass briefly over the demands made by Japan after the Chinese cession of Weihaiwei. Although her interests at stake have been as vital as those of the other powers concerned, throughout all this miserable business she has set the example of a lofty policy, both broad-minded and liberal, which the civilized nations might well have followed. Her defeat of China in the war with that country, and the belligerent hatred of the two nations, one for the other, might have led one to expect that Japan would demand cessions from a humiliated foe in reward for her passive acquiescence in cessions to powers whose claims on China were not as great as her own. Yet this heathen nation of Japan, with a chivalry almost inconceivable, unwilling to impose arbitrary conditions upon a foe toward whom she could afford to maintain a vigorous coercive policy, makes only the mild request that China shall never lease Fookien to any other power than Japan. Truly a magnanimity which, it is to be hoped, will ensure its own reward!

As it would be irreconcilable with the Gallic temperament to keep a finger out of the pie in which she shared an interest with her international neighbors, France looked about at this point to discover some means by which she could urge her claims to partake in China's generosity. Like Germany, she was fortunate in having missionaries who,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with commendable patriotic spirit, placed themselves in the way of being killed in order to simplify the situation. One of these worthy gentlemen, it so happened, was walking in the Chinese town of Kiangsi, when his glance was arrested by a placard, on one of the native houses, in which the Christian doctrine was treated with what, to him, seemed unnecessary harshness. In company with several native converts who accompanied him, he made an attempt to arrest the native who had posted the notice. The cries of the latter attracted the attention of his neighbors; a riot was provoked; and, in the *mêlée*, unfortunately for himself, but fortunately, as it proved, for his government, the missionary was killed. In any civilized country such an affair would be settled simply. A court of inquiry would be held, the evidence of both sides would be heard, and the guilty parties would be punished.

But, in the hands of the proper master, such a simple incident as this can be forged into a lever that will upset mountains. France took advantage of this "happy" accident to make for herself some "happy" arrangements with China. The sorrowing relatives of the missionary were given a solatium of 100,000 francs; Christianity was solaced by the inevitable "Church of the Holy Indemnity"; and, these results having been attained, France took advantage of the occasion to secure some benefits to herself as a sort of profitable side-issue for the trouble involved in settling the weighty business of the death of one missionary in a native broil which he himself had provoked. That the trouble to which she had been put was not altogether unrewarded is shown by the fact that this incident enabled her to wrench from China a concession to construct a railway from Tonkin to Yünnan-fu, with French capital and French engineers, a concession of another and shorter road from Kiangsi to Nanning, and the possession of the Bay of Kwang-chao-wan as a coaling-station. The latter place is of insignificant importance, but this does not lessen the fact that its cession was forced from China in a manner foreign to the dictates of justice and civilized procedure.

The Chinese government began at last to realize that, far from gaining the advantages she had looked for in following this vacillating policy — that is, of safeguarding her territorial and political integrity by conciliating those nations whom she had cause to fear — she had exposed herself to a constant renewal of demands and requests running through the whole gamut of possibility. To these were added various petty annoyances, not formidable in themselves, but all conspiring to stretch to the breaking-point even Chinese forbearance, patient and long-suffering as it is. For instance, France took advantage of her grant at Kwang-chao-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wan to hover about the island of Hainan. This was in itself an overt act of hostility, Hainan being Chinese territory, and was an aggression which, if it had been directed against any civilized power, would have demanded an apology or a declaration of war. Ignoring the protests of the local Chinese governor, French officers visited the island, inspected its harbor, proceeded into the country, and unmistakably and openly led local Chinese officials to believe that France intended to seize upon it at the first favorable opportunity. Let us imagine foreign officers coming into the United States in this way, and let us ask ourselves how long we should let them remain. Yet is the principle in any way different when we apply it to China?

One of the worst features of the situation is the wholly unscrupulous manner in which the civilized powers, by some strange method of reasoning, have followed a unanimous disposition to keep faith with China only so long as a pact of this sort suited their individual aims. This was shown more openly in the two years preceding the Boxer outbreak; for not only was there this general scramble in Pekin, but there was in addition a good deal of severe bullying with regard to railway, mining, and other concessions in the interior. Even England, whose attitude toward inferior peoples is not often open to criticism, seems to lend her countenance to a policy aiming at the utter humiliation of China; nor has she been one whit behind Russia, France, or Germany in trampling on every article in the code of international equity and fair dealing. From the point of view of the European or American trader, the concessions which England has wrung from China may prove beneficial in the long run to that country; but it does not alter the case that, in following this arbitrary method of procedure and in deciding herself what is best for China rather than consulting the views of the Chinese themselves, she has sacrificed on the altar of selfish personal ambition a moral obligation which she owes to civilization. This stricture can be applied with equal sincerity to the other civilized powers who have taken a hand in the spoiling of China.

The citation of a few of the more important events which antedated and led up to the Boxer outbreak, when considered in connection with the potent and more far-reaching influences which have been dilated on, will show how perfectly natural was this subsequent exposition of a truculent Chauvinistic spirit among the Chinese people as a whole. For instance, take England's "requests" for concessional advantages to run small steamers under her own flag on Chinese waterways, and parallel them with the imaginary case of any European nation demanding that ves-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sels flying her flag should control the bulk of traffic on the Mississippi or Missouri. In arousing popular and widespread indignation in China, minor considerations of this character had a more palpable effect than the mere cession of territorial rights on the sea-coast. The ordinary Chinese native, whose ambitions do not aspire higher than providing the means of existence for himself and his family from day to day, would not have troubled himself about these larger policies, even if he could have appreciated their menace. To him the inwardness of diplomatic jugglings was but a vague and uncertain element foreign to his crude understanding; a thing not to be seen in substance and grappled with; a thing, therefore, which to him had no existence. But the introduction of steamers by the "foreign devils" on the interior waterways was a menace at his very door, and one of which he had the evidence of his own eyes. He was not far-sighted enough to perceive that commercial industry would be augmented, and the demand for labor increased. He reasoned that if one steamer could perform the work of a dozen river-boats, the river-boats would have to go; and in this he saw the destruction of his own means of livelihood, with the result that his hatred of foreigners was fanned into an open flame. It cannot be rightly urged, if one is to believe in progression, that it would not be policy to introduce, even in the face of native opposition, the results of civilized endeavor which we know will enhance the prosperity of China by bringing to the rescue of her national resources the stimulation of modern enterprise. Nor have I sought to give this impression. A policy of abandoning China to herself, an attitude of *laissez aller*, would be a world calamity. What is wrong in principle is not the disposition of the civilized powers to exploit China commercially, but the method pursued in doing so. Naturally, if trade advantages are to be utilized by alien peoples for their own financial advantage, China may be excused for believing that she is entitled to some reciprocal return; to a fair share, at least, in the commercial co-partnership of which she is the producing factor, since the moral position of the alien partner is, or should be, merely one of sufferance.

If there were even a solitary instance of a desire among the powers to share justly with China the fruits of her exploitation, there would be in this altruistic policy not a little to commend. But the very course which has been pursued in the past by these civilized powers debars one from placing any faith in such an optimistic view of the future. Their general course right along has been to place China and Chinese interests in an inconspicuous position, and to withhold from her the proportionate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profits to which she is entitled under the generally understood terms of the joint contract. Can she be greatly blamed, therefore, if she compares herself with the hen which laid the golden eggs, and if she reads in this a doom as disastrous as that which overtook the fabled bird?

It would be a great mistake to underrate China, or to lose sight of her ability either to enhance the prosperity of the world or to give it a long period of perturbation. It is not a small nation, or one of political insignificance, that is to be taken into consideration; it is a question of conciliating or antagonizing one-third of the human race. A policy of coercion, and the relegation of Chinese rights to a place in the rear by the interested powers bent merely on profiting to their own advantage, may be temporarily fruitful; but there is a future to be reckoned with. China has not stood still; her dissatisfying experience with civilization has not been profitless; she has learned many a long lesson, and many a bitter one, from which she has not failed to extract elements which will work to her ultimate advantage. The Boxer movement would not have been possible twenty-five years ago. There then existed no certain cohesion between the varying elements of the empire, no nationality of spirit, no consolidated feeling of Chauvinism. The Boxer rising showed us what might be accomplished by this increasing power of consolidation, even in its primary stages. It marked an era of the awakening not merely of Chinese statesmen and politicians, but of China as a whole. While it was instigated and encouraged by the official class, which was thoroughly cognizant of all that was going on, it was a movement in which the common people took an intelligent interest; and the cry of "China for the Chinese" was the expression of a national sentiment, not a meaningless emanation from the mandarins in Pekin. It cannot be said, as regards the missionaries, that their teaching had the appreciable effect in stimulating the anti-foreign movement that has generally been supposed; they were martyrs rather to the belief which has taken hold of the Chinese, and which is not unwarranted by what has occurred in the past, that the civilized nations of the world are bent on their utter extinction as a nation.

I do not seek to apologize for, or to palliate, the barbarous ferocity of the retaliatory measures for which the Chinese government and the Chinese people, as represented by those who partook in the Boxer movement, are responsible. But if the reader has followed closely this review of the more important occurrences inimical to China's integrity which preceded and fomented the Boxer outbreak, I do not think I need comment on the enormity of these proceedings: all unbiassed and fair minds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be revolted by such performances. Nothing more eloquent in denunciation of these doings could be offered than the mere recital of the circumstances themselves, which are related in the official blue-books covering the last five years. Is it not possible that a more neighborly charity, a stricter application of the principle of doing toward others as one would be done by, might have simplified the Christianizing and humanizing of China, and averted a catastrophe fraught with such terrible results? It is easy to decry Chinese cruelty and barbarity; but there is a maxim concerning the throwing of stones by people who live in glass houses. "Let the sleeping dog lie," runs the old proverb; and if by sundry proddings and torments one stirs the beast into retaliatory fury, the burden of blame for subsequent painful events must not rest on his head. This is a simile which, in my belief, explains the Chinese question in a nutshell. If we are tempted to heap opprobrium and contumely on China, we must remember that she was not the initial aggressor; that civilization forced itself upon her, and, by so doing, should have stood as her sponsor, and should have sought to dissipate her traditional antipathies by a discriminating example of moral rectitude and equitable relations. But do the incidents of the past show any inclination on the part of the powers to follow such an eminently just and charitable course? How, therefore, can the Chinese reason other than by the logic of events which have already happened? While civilization needed her aid in breaching the high walls of traditional anti-foreign spirit and exclusiveness, China was led to place faith in the sincere and charitable protestations of disinterested motives.

So the revulsion of Chinese feeling can be easily understood when subsequent diplomatic, commercial, and territorial aggressions, accompanied by an open course of coercion, revealed the real reasons which underlay this apparent solicitude for China's welfare. It is said that foreign diplomats thump the table when making their demands upon the Chinese government, and that on one occasion a Chinese mandarin was so impertinent that, when one of the foreign ministers thumped the table in his presence, he said: "Well, if that's your way, we can do that, too." So he pounded the table in good style. Imagine the belligerent sequence if a minister of a civilized nation were bulldozed and bullyragged in this manner by the official representative of another power who wished to lay before him a "request." In fact, if one gives to these instances their proper significance, one cannot but see that in a comparison of the equity and long-suffering forbearance of China with the inordinately selfish policy of her civilized spoliators, she shows up to conspicuous

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advantage. The Chinese, heretofore, have not been a progressive people. But one can appreciate the resentment of the Chinese foreign office, composed of old-fashioned conservatives deeply steeped in Chinese ideas, when it understood properly the insincerity and double-dealing by which it was being duped. When these officials were rushed upon several times a day by foreign ministers, and had the tables vigorously thumped in front of them, it is small wonder that forbearance gave way to feelings of deep irritation, exasperation, and injured pride. It can be as easily understood that the news of this aggression upon China's integrity was soon widely disseminated among all classes, and that it provoked in the minds of the educated and patriotic Chinese and among the lower classes, who saw in it all a menace to their livelihood, a bitter and revengeful hatred, stimulating the powerful anti-foreign sentiment which made the Boxer uprising possible.

While it is impossible to remedy the mistakes of the past, it is possible, in formulating a policy to be adopted toward China in the future, to take advantage of the lessons which they have taught. The recent disposition of the powers to accord some consideration to the justice of the Chinese claims is a hopeful sign. It may, perhaps, indicate a growing belief among the powers in whose hands rests the fate of China that their attitude in the past has not been altogether blameless, and that in pursuing such a stringent policy they will not be subserving the best interests of the future. The pendulum has swung far in one direction; the moment is at hand when, logically, the counteracting influences of sober, reasonable second thought should cause a corresponding counter movement.

From what I know of China, I am certain that continued coercion and the ignoring of her rights will sow further seeds of distrust and hatred of all civilizing influences, and will prepare for a national uprising at some future date more terrible in its effects than a hundred combined Boxer outbreaks. The Chinese are not an assimilative people; they would not be absorbed by any nation, or nations, that might attempt to conquer and rule them. To a certain extent they are cohesive, their general interests being identical; and the partitioning of China and the drawing of territorial lines would not stifle racial sentiment. This sentiment, in fact, would only be accentuated and consolidated into a powerful political menace in the face of foreign aggression. Six hundred years ago, but for the death of Ogdai, the son of the great Mongol khan, necessitating the recall of the great soldier Batu and his Mongol and Tartar hordes who invaded Europe, the whole course of the world's his-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory would have been changed. That event did much to save Europe from the "yellow peril," as the battle of Lepanto prevented it from becoming Mohammedan. History is said to repeat itself. Can we, then, be certain that we are safe to-day from the swarming descendants of Ogdai and Batu when they are fully aroused? Even commercially and industrially they could swamp our labor markets, and, under another Batu, who might be found when occasion demanded, they could make the "yellow peril" again a real menace.

It would obviously be the wisest policy for the civilized powers to support the Chinese in maintaining the integrity, and assisting in the development, of their country. A politic eye to the future shows that the safest course is to lend a disinterested hand in increasing the power of China and augmenting her prosperity, in maintaining her present established political position, and in protecting her territory against any assault made upon it. With the exception of the Persians, the Chinese are the most actively intelligent of all races on the Asiatic continent, and possess considerable ability in administering their own affairs. Apart from political considerations, and assuming that China will be allowed to enter upon the path of national development, it will soon be shown that she has profited greatly by the injection of Western ideas and methods, from which not only she herself but the world at large will obtain reciprocal advantages. In the end, every nation will find that a merely commercial relation with China, rather than an active political interest in that country, will be fruitful of the best results.

I, for one, believe that the so-called anti-foreign sentiment of China is not so deeply rooted that it would not disappear before a policy of justice, equity, and liberality. If China can be made to believe that civilization is heartily ashamed of its conduct toward her in the past, and that in the future her interests are to be looked after as well as our own, we can safely rely on her assistance in furthering any scheme looking to progress in commerce and civilization. What is necessary, above all else, is to inspire confidence; to provide in visible form an example of our interest in her welfare; to make it clear that promises are concrete things, to be scrupulously regarded at all times, even when they may not for the moment promote our personal advantage; and to show that civilization is to be welcomed as a friend which, instead of menacing her existence, brings to her material advantages. If this policy is inaugurated and pursued strictly by the Western powers, I predict that the stimulus given to commercial and humanizing activity in China will be such as to startle even the most ardent optimists. It is mistrust alone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that begets mistrust, and it is mistrust alone that has restrained China from taking that position to which she is entitled by her geographical situation, by her size, and by her enormous natural resources. Remove the causes of that mistrust, and Chinese sentiment will be pliable to a *rapprochement* which will profit her and will enable the whole world to share equitably in her industrial exploitation.

American influence in the movements of the international convention can be made a powerful force in bringing about such inestimable results. The United States has never shown a disposition to meddle with, or disrupt, the Chinese political fabric. The people of China naturally feel most kindly toward Americans. Official and popular views harmonize in this respect. Deference would be shown by the powers to any suggestion of the United States looking to the maintenance of China's territorial and political integrity, and to an equal sharing of commercial development, without discrimination in favor of any one nation. The advocacy of such an attitude would meet with the cordial support of both England and Japan; and, with the international sentiment so acutely poised, such a combination would be of paramount importance in reaching a definite and lasting conclusion.

Let civilization humanize and modernize China; let it secure as a reward its fair share in the fruits of Chinese industrial resources; let it expand commercially as it will; but, above all else, let it be just.

W. C. JAMESON REID.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE SALE OF TEXAS TO SPAIN: ITS BEARING ON OUR PRESENT PROBLEMS.

DURING the last three years a new phase of an old question has attracted general interest in this country. Stated in its most comprehensive terms, the question is: Have the President and the Senate, by treaty, or Congress and the President, by legislation, the constitutional power to control and deal with territory which is not a part of one of the States of the Union in a manner different from that in which they are bound by the Constitution to control and deal with the territory embraced in the several States?

This question is as old as the Constitution. It confronted the first Congress when it was called upon to legislate for the territory ceded by Great Britain, outside the limits of the original States. It next appeared, in another phase, when Jefferson, in order to protect our expanding commerce by securing control of the mouths of the Mississippi, purchased the province of Louisiana. Jefferson and the statesmen of his school originally thought that the Federal Government had no power, under the Constitution, to acquire territory beyond the limits fixed by the treaty of 1783. But when Monroe and Livingston, our representatives at Paris, reported that they had signed a treaty for the purchase of Louisiana, Jefferson urged his advisers in the Cabinet and his supporters in Congress to secure the immediate ratification of the treaty. He told senators and representatives to be brief in their discussions, and to treat the Constitution *sub silentio*.

The question presented itself in another phase in 1819, when Monroe was called upon to decide whether a part of the territory recently bought of France could be sold by the Federal Government. When Texas applied for admission to the Union, the question came up in still another form. In 1837, so wise and patriotic a statesman as John Quincy Adams offered in the House of Representatives this resolution:

"The power of annexing the people of any independent State to the Union is a power not delegated by the Constitution of the United States to their Congress, or to any department of their Government, but reserved to the people."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In one form or another, this question of the powers of the Federal Government has been discussed at each new acquisition of territory.

Since the conclusion of the recent war with Spain, the question has come to the front in its latest phase. Under prominent leaders the people have taken opposite sides in their opinions as to the power of Congress to levy and collect, in the islands ceded by Spain, duties, imposts, and excises not uniform with those levied and collected in the United States. The general problem involves political, legal, and historical considerations. Congress assumed that it had such power when it passed the Porto Rican Tariff Act a year ago. At the election last November the people approved the exercise of this power; a few weeks ago the Supreme Court affirmed its constitutionality.

Under these circumstances, those who now add to their disapproval of the action of Congress and their condemnation of the verdict of the people their distrust of the wisdom and rectitude of the Supreme Court will hardly be persuaded though one rose from the dead. And yet, if the "Moses and the prophets" of their political faith should return from their graves to testify, they would bear witness that this power was now exercised in accordance with principles which they in their lifetime had uniformly approved. There is, for example, in our history, one chapter scarcely touched upon in the recent discussions of this question, which brings out with great clearness the views on this subject held by the early interpreters of the Constitution.

The sale of Texas is a luminous commentary on the interpretation given to the Federal Constitution by President Monroe and his contemporaries. Few now question the constitutional right of the Federal Government to acquire territory in any way recognized by international law; but opinions divide on the question of dealing with the territory after its acquisition. One school insists that all territory acquired by the Government becomes, immediately upon its acquisition, "an integral part" of the United States, and that its inhabitants become at once citizens of the United States. This is to contend that even where the Federal Government unwillingly acquires territory—for example, through war with a foreign power—the Constitution at once, silently and imperceptibly, through some mysterious force which is inherent in itself, envelops that territory like an atmosphere. One of the favorite expressions of this political school is that all property acquired by the Federal Government must be held in trust for future statehood. Now it has never been suggested that there is in the Constitution any authority, direct or implied, by which Congress, or any other department of the National Government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can sell "an integral part" of the United States. If, therefore, territory lawfully acquired and held by the Government has been sold, this shows that those who made the sale did not consider that territory an integral part of the United States. The sale of Texas to Spain is, therefore, a strong historical argument against the theories of this school of transcendental statesmen.

In most of the discussions concerning the powers of the Federal Government in dealing with newly acquired territory, great confusion has arisen in the minds of speakers and writers, and consequently in the minds of their hearers or readers, through failure to distinguish between the different senses in which the words "the United States" are used in the Constitution and elsewhere. Let us take an illustration from two uses of these words in close proximity in the Constitution. It is provided, in Section 3 of Article II, that the President "shall commission all the officers of the United States." Section 1 of Article III provides thus:

> "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior."

Congress has established courts in all the territories, the judges of which are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. These judges receive their commissions from the President, because they are officers of "the United States," that is, officers of the Nation. They do not hold office during good behavior, but are appointed for four years, because they are not a part of "the judicial power of the United States," that is, of the courts having jurisdiction over the territory and citizens of the several States of the Union.

The second paragraph of Section 3 of Article IV provides:

> "The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Here there is a clear division of territory into two kinds: (1) the territory included within and constituting "the United States;" and (2) other territory outside "the United States," but belonging to "the United States," and subject to the regulation and control of Congress. Now, when it is said, in Section 8 of Article I, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States," there is nothing in the language or context to show that the words "the United States" have a signification different from that in Section 3 of Article IV, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaks of the territory included within the States of the Union. These illustrations are sufficient to show what erroneous conclusions may be reached by always attaching the same meaning to these three words.

President Monroe and his Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, who negotiated the treaty of 1819, and the senators who approved it, regarded the district between the Sabine and the Rio Grande, or Rio Bravo, as it was then called, as territory of the United States, in the sense that it was territory belonging to the United States. Many historians have made the mistake of commending the treaty of 1819 as the settlement of a long-standing dispute between the United States and Spain as to the southwestern boundary. This is like approving such an adjustment of the Alaskan boundary dispute as would cede to Great Britain one-fourth of the territory of Alaska. But we are not now so much concerned in determining what were the merits of the respective claims of the United States and Spain as we are in ascertaining what Monroe, Adams, and their contemporaries, *thought* were the rights of the United States. A review of the events that led up to the treaty of 1819 shows that Monroe and his advisers held that Texas was included in the purchase of Louisiana from France, in 1803, and that the United States, nevertheless, could sell it to Spain, or to any other power.

By the middle of the eighteenth century the North American continent was divided between England, France, and Spain. France had Canada and the valleys of the Ohio and Mississippi. This great interior province, extending from the Rio Grande and the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghanies and the Lakes, was called Louisiana. Spain had the Floridas, Mexico, and the Pacific Coast. England had her thirteen colonies, with uncertain western boundaries merging into the eastern confines of Louisiana. Now, what was our chain of record title, as the lawyers would say, to Texas, when the treaty of 1819 was made, transferring this great province to Spain?

By a secret treaty, signed at Fontainebleau, November 3, 1762, France ceded to the King of Spain "and to his successors forever in full ownership and without any exception or reservation whatever all the country known under the name of Louisiana together with the island of New Orleans." This treaty was made in anticipation of the Peace of Paris, which terminated the long war waged on two continents between England and France. By this latter treaty, France ceded to England all her possessions in North America east of the Mississippi. By the treaty of 1783, concluding the War of Independence, the boundaries of the United States were fixed by the Lakes on the North and by the Mis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sissippi on the West. Spain held the Floridas and Louisiana, and controlled the mouths of the Mississippi and of all the other rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico. These rivers were the highways by which the commerce of the Western States found an outlet. In 1795, Spain gave to the United States, by treaty, the free navigation of the Mississippi, and the right to deposit merchandise at New Orleans and transship it free of duty. This right of deposit was of the greatest value to the settlers west of the Alleghanies.

So matters stood when the second conveyance in our chain of title to Texas was made. By another secret treaty, signed at St. Ildefonso, October 1, 1800, Spain promised, upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, to retrocede to France "the colony or province of Louisiana with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain and that it had when France possessed it." Before Spain delivered Louisiana to France, she received from Napoleon the solemn assurance that he would not transfer the province to any other power. More than three years elapsed after the execution of the treaty of St. Ildefonso before France again took formal possession of her old province in North America. In the meantime, in October, 1802, the Spanish officer in charge at New Orleans had revoked the right of deposit and closed the mouths of the Mississippi to American commerce. This act set the country in a blaze, and even turned Jefferson from his "passion for peace" to the extent of contemplating an alliance with Great Britain.

Events now moved rapidly. Jefferson wrote to Livingston, our minister to France, to secure, if possible, from the First Consul a renewal of the right of deposit. If he could not get this concession, he was to try to buy the island of New Orleans. In January, 1803, Monroe was sent as special envoy to coöperate with Livingston. While they were negotiating with Talleyrand and Marbois, the rupture of the Peace of Amiens turned the thoughts of Napoleon from schemes of colonization in America to the more congenial theme of European war. He wanted money; the American commissioners wanted the mouths of the Mississippi. Napoleon abruptly changed front and offered them the mouths of the Mississippi, with all Louisiana thrown in. On May 2 the bargain was closed, and the treaty, dated April 30, was signed.

This is the third instrument in our chain of title. The treaty, after reciting the terms of the treaty of St. Ildefonso, proceeds:

"And whereas in pursuance of the treaty, and particularly of the third article, the French Republic has an incontestible title to the domain and to the possession of the said territory, the First Consul of the French Republic, desiring to give to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States a strong proof of his friendship, doth hereby cede to the said United States in the name of the French Republic forever and in full sovereignty the said territory with all its rights and appurtenances as fully and in the same manner as they have been acquired by the French Republic in virtue of the above-mentioned treaty concluded with his Catholic Majesty."

On November 30, 1803, Spain delivered Louisiana back to France; and, on December 20, at New Orleans, Claiborne and Wilkinson, representing the United States, received a formal transfer of the province from Laussat, who, twenty days before, had received it from Spain. By this treaty the United States acquired title to all the territory held by France west of the Mississippi prior to 1762. For reasons known only to himself, Napoleon refused to give any precise boundaries to Louisiana in the treaty with the United States, although more than a year before he had given to Victor and Laussat, who were to receive the province from Spain, secret written instructions accurately describing the limits of the province. Before 1762 Spain and France had not agreed upon any boundary between their possessions on the Gulf. From that date to 1803, while Spain held Louisiana, the question of its western boundary of course did not arise. When we acquired possession of the territory, it became necessary to determine at once the extent of our jurisdiction. This led to a dispute with Spain.

The sale of Louisiana was an act of perfidy toward Spain on the part of Napoleon, but we knew nothing of his secret pledge to Spain until after our treaty with France had been published. We were entitled to rely on the warranty of France. Spain protested vigorously against the alienation by France of any part of Louisiana, and insisted that the United States acquired no title to any portion of that territory. So far as France was concerned Spain protested in vain. The Spanish ministers were clay in the hands of Napoleon. Spain, therefore, transferred her remonstrances to the United States, confining them eventually to the claim that the western boundary of Louisiana was somewhere north and east of the Rio Grande. Napoleon was now involved in a war with Great Britain. Notwithstanding his written instructions to Victor, he was willing, as a means of placating Spain, to encourage her in this claim against the United States. These instructions, which were to be presented to the Spanish Captain-General, Somoruelos, who was to deliver over the province on behalf of Spain, gave by exact description the extent of Louisiana as it was to be returned to France, and fixed the Rio Grande as its western boundary.

Although the language of these instructions was not known to Jefferson or to the ministers of the United States, they knew from other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sources that the French possessions extended to the Rio Grande. To the distinguished American historian, Henry Adams, a grandson of Monroe's Secretary of State, belongs the credit of discovering these secret instructions in manuscript in the *Archives de la Marine*, at Paris. They prove beyond question that France and Spain had agreed upon the Rio Grande as the dividing line between their possessions on the Gulf of Mexico, and, hence, that Texas was included in the province of Louisiana sold by Napoleon to the United States. It was only with the encouragement of Napoleon that Spain dared to contend for a boundary farther east. Jefferson knew that Texas was included in the purchase, and, had he not been so completely dominated by French influences, he would have compelled Spain to recognize the Rio Grande as the western boundary of the United States; but he had secured control of the Mississippi, had added an empire to the Union, and, with his passion for peace, a mere trifle of three or four hundred thousand square miles did not seem worth making a fuss over. Accordingly, he tried by peaceful means to induce Spain to recognize our claims, but without success; and, in 1808, diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off.

When intercourse was resumed, by the sending of Don Luis de Onis as Spanish Minister to this country, in 1815, Madison was President and Monroe Secretary of State. An old cause of difference between the two countries had now assumed greater importance than the western boundary question. Spain still held East and West Florida. Since the adoption of the Constitution it had been evident that, sooner or later, this territory must belong to the United States. The rivers which bore the products of the Southern States, destined for the markets of the world, flowed through Spanish territory. West Florida had become the retreat of pirates, lawless adventurers, and hostile Indians, who made frequent predatory incursions into American territory and attacks upon our commerce. Spain was unable to suppress these outlaws, and the acquisition of the Floridas was demanded by the people of the South as an act of self-protection.

Negotiations for the exchange of Texas for the Floridas now began, and continued for over five years. On February 22, 1819, John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, and Luis de Onis, Spanish Minister, signed at Washington a treaty by which Spain ceded the Floridas to the United States; and the boundary line between the two countries, west of the Mississippi, was fixed at the River Sabine:

"The Two High Contracting Parties agree to cede and renounce all their rights, claims and pretensions to the territories described by the same Line; that is to say,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States hereby cede to His Catholic Majesty, and renounce forever, all their rights, claims, and pretensions to the Territories lying West and South of the above-described Line."

This was by its terms a treaty of cession. Each party renounced the claims of its citizens against the other, and the United States agreed to appropriate a sum not to exceed $5,000,000 for the payment of claims of her citizens against Spain. If we suppose that the claims of Spanish citizens against the United States were equal to this amount — and, when we consider the expedition of the *Miranda* and Jackson's excursions in western Florida, they could hardly have been less — then the treaty of 1819 was simply an exchange of Texas for Florida. The instrument itself is conclusive proof that we owned Texas, and that Spain did not. Spain had not then been reduced to the extremity of parting with valuable possessions to an eager purchaser for the mere satisfaction of having a boundary-line definitively established. If we had been driving a hard trade with such a helpless power, we should have put the boundary at the Rio Grande. As it was, we felt that we were dealing fairly in the matter, and Spain felt that she was not getting the worst of the bargain. If we did not sell Texas to Spain, then Spain gave us Florida for nothing.

Since the discoveries of Henry Adams were published in his "History of the United States," nothing new has been added to the story of the sale of Texas. It is a chapter in our national annals to which we revert with little satisfaction and no pride. The transaction assumes a new interest and importance at this time on account of its bearing upon the questions now occupying the public mind respecting the authority of the Federal Government over the islands ceded by Spain. Did Monroe and Adams, and the Congress that approved the treaty of 1819, regard Texas as territory belonging to the United States? No man living at the time knew so much about the purchase of Louisiana, and the facts connected with its subsequent history, as did Monroe. He had been special envoy to France, and, as such, had signed the treaty of purchase. He had been sent on a special mission to Madrid, in 1805, to settle the boundary dispute with Spain. As Secretary of State, he had begun the negotiations which resulted in the treaty which he signed as President. When, as Secretary of State, he wrote to Onis, on June 10, 1816, he expressed not only his own views, but those, also, of President Madison, of Livingston, his colleague at Paris in 1803, and of Jefferson, under whose instructions he was then acting. In his letter to the Spanish Minister he said:

"With respect to the western boundary of Louisiana, I have to remark that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government has never doubted, since the treaty of 1803, that it extended to the Rio Bravo."

Adams took up the correspondence with Onis where Monroe left off, when the latter became President. Their negotiations lasted until the treaty was signed, and cover nearly two hundred quarto pages of the American State Papers. Onis claimed the Mississippi as the eastern boundary of the Spanish possessions. Adams insisted on the Rio Bravo, and thus summed up his arguments in a letter dated March 12, 1818:

"Well might Messrs. Pinckney and Monroe write to Mr. Cevallos, in 1805, that the claim of the United States to the boundary of the Rio Bravo was as clear as their right to the island of New Orleans."

In his annual message of December 7, 1819, President Monroe, in commenting on the failure of Spain to ratify the treaty, said:

"For territory ceded by Spain, other territory of great value, to which our claim was believed to be well founded, was ceded by the United States, and in a quarter more interesting to her."

Onis was recalled in 1820 and was succeeded by General Vives. Adams was of the opinion that the new minister ought to have brought the king's ratification of the treaty; and, when he learned that he had not done so, he wrote to Vives, on April 21, expressing his surprise, and accusing the Spanish sovereign of bad faith. His patience was exhausted, and he was quite ready to declare war, take the Floridas, and collect the claims of United States citizens by force. On May 2 he closed a letter to Vives with these ominous words:

"Their right of territory was, and yet is, to the Rio del Norte. I am instructed to declare that, if any further delay to the ratification by His Catholic Majesty of the treaty should occur, the United States could not hereafter accept either of $5,000,000 for the indemnities due to their citizens by Spain, nor of the Sabine for the boundary between the United States and the Spanish territories."

The treaty of 1819 received the unanimous approval of the Senate when it first came before that body; and, on its final consideration, in 1821, only four votes were cast against it. In the House, the legislation for carrying the treaty into effect was passed without even a division. Henry Clay, who was then Speaker, opposed the treaty because Florida was not an adequate consideration for Texas, and because Congress, not the President and Senate, had the constitutional power to alienate territory. He introduced in the House the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States vests in Congress the power to dispose of territory belonging to them, and that no treaty, purporting to alienate any portion thereof, is valid without the concurrence of Congress.

2. Resolved, That the equivalent proposed to be given by Spain, to the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States, in the treaty, concluded between them, on the 22d day of February, 1819, for that part of Louisiana lying west of the Sabine, was inadequate; and that it would be inexpedient to make a transfer thereof to any foreign power, or renew the aforesaid treaty."

In speaking to these resolutions Mr. Clay said:

"In the case of the Florida Treaty it was not pretended that the object was simply a declaration where the western boundary of Louisiana was; it was, on the contrary, the case of an avowed cession of territory from the United States to Spain."

He presumed that the spectacle would not be presented of questioning in that branch of the Government our title to Texas, which had been constantly maintained by the Executive for more than fifteen years past, under three several administrations. He was, at the same time, ready and prepared to make out our title if any in the House were fearless enough to controvert it.

Throughout the country, the purchase of Florida met with general approval; and, as it was effected by the sale of Texas, the latter was, at least, not unpopular. The only objection to the acquisition of Florida was that it increased the slave territory of the Union; and the people of the North were glad to waive this objection in view of the alienation of Southern territory six times the extent of Florida. The Southern people looked complacently upon the sale of Texas, because, with Monroe, they believed that, sooner or later, it would return. And so the treaty of 1819 made Monroe the most popular man in the country, and made Adams a presidential possibility. At the election of 1820 Monroe received every vote but one in the Electoral College, and in 1825 Adams became President.

In considering Monroe's conception of the powers of the Federal Government to alienate territory, it is important to note his reason for selecting the Sabine as the eastern boundary of the district sold to Spain, a boundary which had never been contended for by either party. In 1812 Louisiana had been admitted into the Union as a State, with the Sabine River and the 94th meridian as her western boundary. There was no significance at that time in the selection of this line. It might just as well have been the Trinity River and the 95th meridian, or the Brazos River and the 96th meridian. Now, when Adams came to agree with Onis on the extent of the territory to be ceded to Spain, although Onis insisted on a boundary east of the Sabine, Adams would not even listen to such a proposition. He drew a sharp distinction between the powers of the Federal Government over territory incorporated into the Union as part of a State, and territory belonging to the United States,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but outside the limits of any State. The Sabine, therefore, was as far east as Monroe and Adams thought they had the power to go.

Even the Spanish minister, who had fought so valiantly with his pen in the contention that the United States did not own Texas, gracefully admitted, after the conflict was over and the treaty had been signed, that, in making the claims he did, he was simply fighting to get all the territory he could for his sovereign, and that he thought Spain fared well in securing Texas. After his return to Madrid he published a pamphlet, entitled "Memoir upon the Negotiations between Spain and the United States of America, which led to the Treaty of 1819." In explaining what he had accomplished, he said:

"An impartial public will judge whether the Treaty of the 22d of February, 1819, (which is improperly called a treaty of cession, as it is in reality one of exchange or permutation of one small province for another of double the extent, richer and more fertile,) deserves the epithet of disgraceful. . . . I will agree, however, that for greater perspicuity, I might have extended the 3d article in the following terms: 'In exchange, the United States cede to his Majesty the province of Texas, etc.,' as the Government wished me to express it; but as I had, in the correspondence for three years, contended that the province belonged to the King, it would have been a contradiction to say in the treaty that the United States ceded it to his Majesty, the same thing being obtained by the terms in which it is expressed."

President Polk gave a more careful study to the history of the sale of Texas than any other of our statesmen since the time of Monroe and Adams. In his inaugural address he said: "Texas was once a part of our country . . . was unwisely ceded away to a foreign power." In his second annual message, he said: "Down to the conclusion of the treaty, in February, 1819, by which this territory was ceded to Spain, the United States asserted and maintained their territorial rights to this extent" — that is, to the Rio Grande. In both these documents he refers to the admission of the young republic as the "reunion," or "reannexation," of Texas.

The country to-day is facing the same problem that perplexed Jefferson and Monroe. The question which confronts us is: What are the powers of the Federal Government over the islands ceded by Spain to the United States? The problem that confronted Monroe was: What are the powers of the Federal Government over the territory ceded to the United States by France? In deciding this question, Monroe and the statesmen of his time made, in the first place, a clear distinction between territory incorporated into the Union as part of one of the several States, and territory outside the limits of any State, but belonging to the United States. It was held that territory outside the limits of the States, and belonging to the United States, could be regulated and disposed of by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federal Government, regardless of the limitations and restrictions of the Constitution. In accordance with this principle, Monroe and the officers of his Administration, Congress, and the people generally believed that the President and Senate, by treaty, could sell such territory and expatriate the inhabitants thereof.

It is a singular fact that the only alienation of United States territory to a European monarch should have been made by that President who, a few years thereafter, gave his name to the popular American doctrine that the extension of sovereignty by a European monarch over territory on the American continent would be looked upon as an unfriendly act by the United States. The principle on which Monroe acted, in 1819, would to-day authorize the President and Senate to sell Alaska to Great Britain, Arizona to Mexico, or the Philippine Islands to Germany. We may be sure, however, that this principle will never be invoked for the purpose of selling territory of the United States on this continent to any European power; for the Monroe doctrine of 1823, that the American continent is for American republics, now controls the Monroe doctrine of 1819.

In case it should again seem wise or expedient to dispose of any national territory, Clay's contention would undoubtedly prevail, that the right of alienation of property belonging to the United States is vested in Congress, and not in the treaty-making power. Nevertheless, the sale of Texas still remains an unviolated historical precedent in support of the contention that the Federal Government has the absolute power to acquire territory outside the Union, and to regulate and dispose of it, independently of the provisions of the Constitution relating to territory incorporated into the Union. The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Porto Rican tariff cases is in harmony with this precedent, although the views of Monroe and his contemporaries and the significance of the sale of Texas are not alluded to in the briefs of counsel or in the opinion of the court.

HENRY SHERMAN BOUTELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# MEDICAL PRACTICE AND THE LAW.

DURING the present year public attention has been directed to the legislatures of seven States where vigorous contests have arisen over efforts to pass laws defining the practice of medicine. These States are New York, Missouri, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana, and California. In Missouri, Indiana, and California these efforts were successful, and partially so in Alabama; but in New York and Kentucky the battle must again be waged before subsequent legislatures, as it must be waged in all the other States where no adequate definition exists either by statute or judicial interpretation. Not only have the legislatures been called upon to settle this mooted question, but in various ways the fight has been carried into the courts of many States, notably Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Georgia.

The purpose of this article is to outline briefly the present status of the so-called "medical practice acts"; to emphasize the urgent need for an adequate definition of the practice of medicine as a necessary part of these acts; to suggest the correct legal principle underlying and justifying such a definition; and to show the fallacious nature of the objections urged against it by those who would be driven out of business by its adoption.

For a long time the medical profession declined to lead in the agitation for rigid restrictions of medical practice. Even now some physicians contend that they are not interested in suppressing quacks. But as illegal practice came more and more to be a serious public menace, the great body of the profession stepped as usual into the breach and began the battle for the protection of the public health.

The physician, being fully equipped to defend himself and his family against the dangers of ignorant healers, is affected least of all by the failure of the State to exclude the latter from indiscriminate practice; yet, in accordance with the tradition of his self-sacrificing and heroic profession, and because of his superior skill and knowledge, the public looks to him to direct the struggle for the preservation of the public health. In his demand for an adequate legal definition of his science, the physician should be supported by every profession; for the same public policy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that upholds the right of the State to exclude the ignorant from treating the sick also upholds the right to exclude the ignorant from practising law, chemistry, engineering, navigation, plumbing, in fact, all professions and trades where knowledge and skill are necessary. All these trades and professions are regulated not for the purpose of creating a monopoly for those who enter them in accordance with the law, but to protect the persons and property of the public, which should at all times be the chief solicitude of every conscientious legislator.

Few civilized countries permit the indiscriminate practice of medicine. Generally speaking, it is almost universal to require every practitioner of this science to pass successfully an examination in its numerous branches, and to register the license which he obtains as a result thereof. In the more enlightened countries the practitioner must possess as well a common-school education, and in addition be a man whose moral qualifications are properly vouched for. Provisions are made for a public registration of the license obtained from the State, and it is usually made a misdemeanor to practise without the required registration. Acts of this character, while really a part of the public health laws, are generally known as "medical practice acts." It will be noted that they do not prescribe what means or methods a man shall use in treating the sick. No particular school or theory of medicine is favored or endorsed. These laws merely require the applicant for a license to show the requisite knowledge of disease, its cause, its cure, etc., before he is permitted to practise in any manner. In a word, they demand nothing more or less than an educational qualification from all those who seek to practise a profession in which education is preëminently an essential.

To dwell upon the dangers incident to the indiscriminate practice of unqualified practitioners is to advance again the unanswerable arguments which served to bring about the medical practice acts in the first instance. Courts of last resort everywhere have pointed out these dangers, and have declared that public policy demands their suppression by an exercise of the police powers of the State. If there is no fixed standard of education and knowledge for those who undertake to heal disease, the citizen is left at the mercy of any incompetent person who, preying upon the gullibility and ignorance of the sick and despondent, repletes his own pocket-book while he depletes the health and fortune of his victims. The purity and sanctity of the fireside and sick-room are not protected from invasion; for the unlicensed practitioner is at liberty to ignore the mental and moral qualifications demanded by all medical practice acts. Worst of all, helpless children and invalids are left a prey to the charla-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tan, with his cure-all nostrums or his *laissez faire* denial of disease and pain. It is a well-known fact that some insurance organizations are making it very difficult for Christian Scientists to obtain life insurance. The State should protect its citizens no less zealously than the insurance companies their treasuries.

Since, then, the State has thus sought, in the interest of the public health, to make a knowledge of disease a pre-requisite for the practice of medicine, why are Christian Scientists, osteopaths, vitopaths, hydropaths, clairvoyants, and scores of other pseudo-scientists, without skill and knowledge in the treatment of disease, permitted to practise in what seems to be an open disregard of the medical laws?

The question turns upon what is, in law, the practice of medicine. Before a punishment can be inflicted for irregular practice, it is necessary to determine what the law considers irregular practice. It would seem, on general principles, that any one who professes to heal the sick is professing to be a physician, and that any one who gives treatment for the cure of disease is practising medicine. Many of the States, either by express statutory enactment or by judicial interpretation, have taken this natural and rational view of the science of medicine. Some courts, however, in the absence of an express enactment to the contrary, have inclined to look upon "the application and use of medicine and drugs" as the criterion by which the representatives of the law shall determine what is the practice of medicine.

This narrow view of the healing art is utterly at variance with its present advanced state. The practice of medicine is not the practice of any particular means or method of healing, but has reference (1) to the proper diagnosis of disease, and (2) to the practice of all means for its alleviation and cure. The medical schools of to-day reject no methods or agents that have any known efficacy in relieving suffering. Mind cure, hypnotism, massage, and electricity all have their uses in the comprehensive science of medicine; but the physician, with his scientific analysis and unbiassed judgment, refuses to become a charlatan and say that any one of these methods is the only cure in the treatment of disease. Neither does he say that the use of drugs and medicines is always essential. Indeed, when *not* to use them is a most important part of his knowledge. Each discovery made by modern science that promises to lessen the sum of human suffering is eagerly investigated by medical men; and if, after an experiment, it is found to be of real value, it is published to the world, and henceforth takes its place as one of the remedies employed by the practitioner of medicine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best lexicographers have realized this broad view of the science of medicine. The Standard Dictionary defines "medicine" as "The healing art; the science of the preservation of health and of treating disease for the purpose of cure." The Century Dictionary gives this definition: "The art of preventing, curing, or alleviating diseases, and remedying as far as possible the results of violence and accident."

Wherever the courts have taken a less comprehensive view of the healing art, and have declared that no one practises medicine unless he gives drugs, a most unfortunate state of affairs is found to exist. A Christian Scientist may put out a shingle as a Christian Science doctor, and give "treatment," either present or "absent," to every one willing to pay the required fee. He—or more often she—may practise upon young children with contagious diseases, or upon imbeciles with vacant minds; he may loudly proclaim ability to heal, and yet, forsooth, because no drugs are given, he is not liable to punishment for practising medicine. The osteopath can boast of his perfect system of anatomy, diagnosis, and treatment, and he, too, can be known as "doctor," and go about practising upon the sick without fear, merely because, to evade the law, he proclaims the harmfulness of drugs. And so, in those States where no adequate definition exists, we find that scores of quacks, driven from the use of drugs, now ply their trade under some other guise and behind some high-sounding name.

A directory of the aliases thus assumed by the old-time drug charlatan must needs be revised daily; for many fertile brains are busy coining them, and many people, not all of them weak and helpless, are willing to believe the stories of marvellous cures wrought "without the aid of drugs after the doctor had given up the patient." In those unfortunate States where such a condition exists, it is no wonder that a demand should go up for a definition that will apply to all healers of disease.

The definition just passed by the legislature of Indiana provides:

"To heal, cure, or relieve, or to attempt to heal, cure, or relieve those suffering from injury or deformity, or disease of mind or body, or to advertise or to announce to the public in any manner a readiness or ability to heal, cure, or relieve those who may be suffering from injury, or deformity, or disease of mind or body, shall be to engage in the practice of medicine within the meaning of this act."

Judge Martin, of Bedford, Indiana, the first judge to pass upon this law, has very recently upheld it in a case brought against a certain "magnetic healer."

The recent California act declares, among other things:

"Those who profess to be, or hold themselves out as being, engaged as doctors, physicians, or surgeons in the treatment of disease, injury, or deformity of human



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beings, or those who for pecuniary or valuable consideration shall prescribe medicine, magnetism, or electricity in the treatment of disease, injury, or deformity of human beings shall be deemed as practising medicine."

The Missouri act, also passed at the last session of the General Assembly of that State, provides:

"It shall be unlawful for any person not now a registered physician within the meaning of the law to practise medicine or surgery in any of its departments, or to profess to cure and attempt to treat the sick and others affected with bodily or mental infirmities."

At the session of the New York legislature just closed, an effort was made by the Medical Society of the State of New York to secure the passing of a definition embodying the principles quoted above. In view of the great need for such a definition the effort to pass such a law is not surprising. What is surprising is that intelligent people could be induced to raise their voices in opposition, and that legislatures would listen to their clamor while turning a deaf ear to the cries of those who suffered from their failure to act. The clairvoyants, hydropaths, and many others with names even more fearful and impressive were on hand to abuse the accumulated wisdom of ages as represented by the regular school of medicine, and to claim for their individual methods a monopoly of efficacy and power.

The osteopaths made up in energy what they lacked in numbers and logic, and were brought forward into the public gaze through the supposed advocacy of their cause by no less a personage than Mr. Samuel L. Clemens, better known as "Mark Twain." The osteopath differs from the other opponents of regular medical practice in claiming a scientific basis for his science. His theory is, briefly stated, that disease results from a displacement of the bones, muscles, and nerves of the body. The original school of osteopathy, located in a Western State, claims to have a regular system of education, and to teach the peculiar methods of osteopathy on a scientific basis, after the fashion of other schools. Indeed, the devotees of this system insisted that their claims were capable of much more accurate demonstration than those of the regular profession.

This being so, it was pointed out to them that the proposed bill simply required practitioners of the healing art to take a four-year course, and to pass a successful examination at the end thereof. The osteopaths were then asked why they objected to this educational requirement, and why they should be permitted to practise their "comprehensive science" after a course of a few years in a Western school, when the law required the regular practitioner to take a four-year course in some school recognized by the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This brought their claims perilously near the *reductio ad absurdum*. It was seen that their effort to gain recognition was in effect an attack on the high standard of education which New York has erected after many years of agitation. Such an illogical and unfair position could not be maintained successfully; and their demand for recognition, on the terms proposed, met a prompt refusal at the hands of the legislators, in spite of the fact that some States with lax medical laws have legalized their practice. Mr. Clemens was frank enough to say:

"I don't know that I cared much about these osteopaths until I heard you were going to drive them out of the State; but since I heard that I haven't been able to sleep."

His plea was not a plea for osteopathy, as its champions had hoped, but a plea for what he was pleased to term "personal liberty." He said in this connection:

"Now, what I contend is that my body is my own, at least I have always so regarded it. If I do harm through my experimenting with it, it is I who suffer, not the State."

This argument entirely ignores the point at issue. The idea is not to prevent a man from doing what he wishes with his own, so much as to prevent the charlatan from doing what he pleases with the bodies and pockets of others. As was well said in an effective reply to this contention:

"If a jaunty experimenter in everything that comes along should choose to indulge in the throwing of lighted torches upon the roofs of his neighbors' houses, doubtless the strong hand of the law would promptly step in and stop him from trying at least that particular experiment. But if he calls to his child's sick-bed a person who has been in no way qualified to recognize disease, he is putting his neighbor's life into quite a serious danger. Yet in the latter case let the strong hand of the law step in, and at once the air is full of rodomontades on the sacredness of personal liberty. Is this jaunty experimenter to be permitted to give everything a chance, even the deadly microbe of scarlet fever, typhus, and smallpox?"

It seems difficult to imagine how an educational qualification for the practice of a learned profession can be considered an invasion of personal liberty. Every lawyer knows that the courts, without exception, have upheld medical practice acts when attacked as unconstitutional on this as well as on other grounds. As was said by the New York Court of Appeals (People *vs.* Hawker, 152 N. Y. 241):

"The Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; yet this provision of the organic law is made subordinate to that of paramount necessity, and the rights secured thereby to the citizens must yield to that of the preservation of the public health. The legislature,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore, in the exercise of its discretion under the police powers of the State may, by act, impose reasonable conditions and requirements under which individuals may practise the profession of medicine, and to restrain and prohibit all persons not complying therewith from engaging in such practice."

The osteopaths and other irregular practitioners were aided by the religious sect commonly known as Christian Scientists. The physician rejects no known remedy in his fight against disease: this sect rejects all. No wonder it has been said of them that "they are neither scientific nor Christian."

The grounds of their opposition were many. Among other things, they very seriously contended that if they were required to study the laws of disease and how to diagnose it, they could not retain the mental and spiritual frame of thought necessary for the practice of their own methods. It may be suggested, in passing, that dangerous and unreasonable practices usually disappear when enlightenment and study begin. But ostensibly their chief opposition was on the ground that to prohibit their practice was to prohibit a free exercise of religious liberty guaranteed by the Constitution. A most sacred plea this! The shrewdness of the Christian Scientists has been shown in nothing more than in the persistence with which they have advanced this argument. In America, essentially a liberty-loving country, official intolerance and interference with religious liberty will never, let us hope, be countenanced by any legislature or any court.

But can it be said that the State, in denying Christian Scientists the right to heal the sick before qualifying themselves for such practice, is depriving them of religious liberty?

The Supreme Court of the United States has said (Davis *vs.* Beason, 133 U. S. 333):

"The term religion has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for His being and character and of obedience to His will. It is often confounded with the *cultus* or form of worship of a particular sect, but it is distinguishable from the latter. It was never intended or supposed that the Constitution could be invoked as a protection against legislation for the punishment of acts inimical to the peace, good order, and morals of society. . . . However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the criminal laws of the country, passed with reference to actions regarded by general consent as properly the subject of punitive legislation."

And the same court, in again discussing the right of a polygamist to escape the law against plural marriage, on the theory that his religious liberty was invaded, said:

"Laws are made for the government of actions, and, while they cannot interfere with mere religious beliefs and opinions, they may with practices.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Suppose that one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice?

Or if a wife religiously believed it was her duty to burn herself upon the funeral pile of her dead husband, would it be beyond the power of civil government to prevent her carrying her belief into practice?"

In a recent case in Pennsylvania the courts of that State passed upon this very point, in refusing to grant a charter to Christian Scientists as a religious corporation. The court said:

"If the purpose of the proposed corporation were only to include a creed, or to promulgate a form of worship, no question could arise, . . . but the most cursory examination of the tenets and of the books . . . shows an effort to establish a prescribed method of practising the art of healing the diseases of the body. . . . The treatment extends to the most serious and fatal of diseases (quoting 'Science and Health,' 422). 'If the case to be mentally treated is consumption, take up the leading points included, according to belief, in that disease. Show that it is not inherited; that inflammation, tubercles, hemorrhage, and decomposition are beliefs. Then these ills will disappear.' If the lungs are disappearing, this is but one of the beliefs of mortal mind. It is quite clear, therefore, that what is proposed is much more than a church, since there is besides to be established a system for the treatment of disease."

The most recent pronouncement of our courts on the subject is a very learned and scholarly opinion of Judge Lumpkin, a judge of the Superior Court of Georgia. He decided that, under the Georgia definition, the practice of Christian Science was the practice of medicine, and that to prohibit this practice was not an infringement of religious liberty.

Within the last twelve months, two women were arrested in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, under the medical practice acts of that State. These women had administered the so-called Christian Science treatment to an eleven-year-old girl suffering from diphtheria. She died in a few hours after being placed in the hands of the "healers." The defendants were found guilty; and Judge N. B. Neelen, in delivering the opinion of the court, said in part as follows:

"Christian Science is, then, at the same time a religious belief and a system for the cure of diseases. As far as Christian Scientists constitute a religious body, they are entitled to be treated with perfect toleration, and to have entire freedom to hold and teach their doctrine; but when the professors of these doctrines hold themselves as able to heal physical ailments, the question arises whether they render themselves amenable to the laws regulating the practice of medicine.

Under existing laws to heal the sick or, to use equivalent words, 'to practise medicine,' is not construed by the courts as applying exclusively to the administration of drugs and the use of instruments, but may properly be construed to mean the treatment in any manner of one who is ill, as, for instance, a Christian Science healer or practitioner, for a fee. Consequently, I hold that Christian Scientists undertaking the cure of the sick without having first secured a license to practise medicine become subject to the penalties of the law. This in no way interferes with the religious belief of anybody.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One may employ what plumber he pleases, but the plumber must be duly qualified, or it is an offence for him to perform the work. Many other like instances might be cited, but it is believed that these are enough to show that it is the policy of the law not to restrict the right to employ whom one pleases, but for the public good and health it requires that the one permitting himself to be employed must be possessed of certain qualifications. The enacting of such laws is clearly within the police powers of the State, and it is strictly within the doctrine laid down in the so-called Mormon case in the Supreme Court of the United States, where it is held that with man's relation to his Maker and the obligations he may think they impose, and the manner in which an expression shall be made by him of his belief, no interference can be permitted, provided always the laws of society, designed to secure its health, peace, and prosperity, are not interfered with. However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the laws of the land."

Since Judge Neelen delivered this opinion, it has been overruled by Judge Elliot of the circuit court. Unfortunately for the public health, the law in this instance does not allow the State to appeal to the court of last resort. The judge who overruled this decision decided that "prayer was not medicine," which is patent to all, but he ignored the fact that the two healers before him had treated a helpless child afflicted with a deadly contagious disease, had accepted money for their treatment, and had held themselves out as healers of disease. Judge Elliot's decision, unless overruled, necessitates another struggle in the State of Wisconsin against empiricism and dangerous practices under the guise of religion.

The Supreme Court of Nebraska, in a Christian Science case, said:

"Under the indictment, the sole question presented upon the evidence was whether or not the defendant within the time charged had operated on, or professed to heal or prescribe for, or otherwise treat, any physical or mental ailment of another.

There was involved no question of sentiment nor of religious practice or duty. If the defendant was guilty as charged, neither pretence of worship nor of the performance of any other duty should have exonerated him from the punishment which an infraction of the statute involved."

It will thus be seen that, while some few courts have declared that the practice of Christian Science is not the practice of medicine, no court has ever held that to prohibit such practice by positive law is an invasion of religious liberty.

Several years ago an attempt was made in New York State to obtain a definition of the practice of medicine along the lines of the definition proposed in the last Assembly. It was effectually shelved in the legislature because a senator said that it would drive out of business a bone-setter who, he thought, had saved his life. The effort made before the present legislature developed an equally remarkable opposition. A retired lawyer, who was formerly one of the great leaders of the New York bar, de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clared himself unalterably opposed to the proposed definition because, if it became a law, it would prevent him from prescribing remedies to a lady who often visited his house. But perhaps the most effective reason for the opposition was that the votes of the irregular practitioners and their friends would be used to defeat any legislator who voted for the definition. These objections, while only a few of those actually advanced, are sufficient to bring out strongly the necessity for educating the public to a realization of the principle involved in the medical practice acts. When this is thoroughly understood, a general demand that no legislature can resist will go up from the people for the enactment of the desired law.

Nor should other professional men leave the physician alone in his work of agitation and education. It was an encouraging sign when fifty lawyers of reputation at the New York City bar voluntarily presented a printed memorial to the last New York Assembly, endorsing the proposed bill to define the practice of medicine. Who knows when some sect may claim that the writing of wills and the pleading of causes is a "religious belief"? The same Assembly that refused to define the practice of medicine was eager to admit to the practice of law by special acts a number of laymen who were unable or unwilling to stand the regular bar examination. It was only when Governor Odell emphatically vetoed such vicious legislation that the State was spared this humiliating step in a most dangerous direction.

With the professions of law and medicine made subjects of patronage by legislatures, all standards of professional education are endangered. Instead of these standards being raised year by year, as the best men in all professions desire, the time may come when all barriers will be swept away. The learned professions will then become a field for the unlearned and vicious, and the health and property of the citizens will become a source of plunder to the quack and the pettifogger.

CHAMPE S. ANDREWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## THE SHORTENED COLLEGE COURSE: GRADUATE OPINION.

We have been discussing the three years' college course in the light of general principles. The discussion has been more or less enlightening. The reasoning has been *a priori*, and *a priori* reasoning upon many educational subjects is sound, though subject to severe limitations. But already the community includes scores and even hundreds of men, in most cases educated at Harvard, who received their degree after three years of study. These men are engaged in all callings, commercial and professional. Many of them took their degree not less than ten years ago. They represent a body which is able to furnish significant testimony touching the advantage or disadvantage of the shortened college course. From many of these gentlemen I have lately received statements containing their judgment of the wisdom of completing a college course in three years. These statements represent a new method of finding out the truth about this rather serious business of the length of a college course.

It is first to be said that all these gentlemen believe that the value of a college education should not be impaired. Whether the time be three years or four, two years or five, the worth of the education should not be lessened. The A.B. degree should not be in any way cheapened. The first degree taken at Yale or Harvard after three years of work should be as significant as the same degree taken after four years. The ideal of education, whether that ideal be scholarship or training or culture, should not be lowered. Through this assurance aid is given in removing one of the perils of the general introduction of the three years' course; for, colleges that receive students into their freshman classes with a training and knowledge less by a year than the requirements of other colleges, would be obliged, in case a degree were given in three years, to cheapen that degree. This result could not fail to cause a distinct deterioration of the worth of a college education. The graduates under such a condition would, as a body, be less mature in thought, less able in reasoning, less cultured in manner, less symmetrical in development, less reverential in spirit, and less noble in character. Such a result American life could ill afford. Not for a moment can the college consider any method which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may result in diminishing its contribution to human betterment. Therefore, at once be it said that, whatever be the length of the college course, the present value of the college education must be maintained.

A fundamental principle concerning the length of the college course is this: *it should be made to depend on the student himself.* To this judgment most graduates assent. For certain men three years are enough; for other men four years are none too many.

The men who should complete their course in the shorter period are of three classes. (1) Those who use a college education as a means of fitting themselves for professional study and practice should be content with the shorter time. In particular, those students who purpose to become physicians should complete their college work in three years. To the student who is to become a physician the question of time is a serious consideration. Not only has the medical school lengthened its course from two years to three and from three years to four, but post-graduate studies and training demand an additional period of four years. The deans of our best medical schools are now advising their students to spend eight years in professional study. To the four years spent in the medical school should be added one or two years in a hospital and also two or three years of residence abroad. Such a prolonged curriculum demands that time be saved at whatever point it may be possible.

(2) The need of economy in time is not confined to the medical school, although it is there most highly accentuated. A consideration of quite a different character applies to other professions than the medical. The student who goes to college in order to secure training for professional purposes not infrequently finds that in three years he has received all the training of which he is naturally capable. Further training would prove to be over-training. Over-training is a training in which no proper response is found in the man himself to the stimulus given from without. The stimulus to think is applied to the mind over-trained; but the mind does not think as a result of the stimulus. An influence which would usually quicken the mind now proves powerless. The mind has become stale. It has lost interest. It has no spring, no buoyancy. Its mood of eagerness and enthusiasm is supplanted by a mood of indifference and sluggishness. Several of my correspondents write of this lamentable condition as actually existing in their own cases, and as one which would have been much aggravated by a fourth year at college.

(3) There are also certain types of men who are more benefited by the briefer period of collegiate residence. One type is represented by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the indolent man. Most college men are not, despite the too common contrary opinion, to be charged with laziness. But, of course, there are college men who are lazy, and, of course too, they are more numerous than they ought to be. The best method of dealing with such men consists in simply obliging them to work hard — to work ten hours a day for six days a week and for more than four weeks of every month. For men of this type the shorter course is undoubtedly the better. It must be remembered, too, that a man may even be indolent for three years and still graduate at their close. A physician writes me: "I entered college from Phillips Academy, Andover, and went through largely on my fitting school training, developing such lazy habits that another year could not have changed me for the better." Certainly for a man of this type three years are ample.

The man, too, who is inclined to be scatter-brained and desultory in habits of thought and study finds a gain in the shorter period. Concentration of intellectual power represents, of course, one of the most precious results of a college course; and this concentration is fostered by the three years' period. One of the chief advantages of the examination system, for instance, is the necessity of applying all of one's powers to a definite duty for a specific time — an advantage which is specially precious for the man of loose intellectual habits. It may also be said in passing that the man of small purse or of many years has special inducements for taking the shorter period.

The three years' course, however, is subject to serious objections. The abbreviated time removes many, though not all, of the opportunities for general reading, for large investigations of large subjects, and for availing oneself of many of the avocations or side-interests of college life. The student is obliged to keep his forehead close down to the college grindstone, and the grindstone is turned rapidly. One of my correspondents, a merchant of New York, says:

"The necessary rush entailed in thus crowding the requisite number of courses into three-quarters of the time prescribed for four years by tradition and experience affects thoroughness and a proper absorption. This haste also tends to demolish class feeling and social intercourse, factors of great consideration both during and after college days. In consequence, it is impossible that the education of the three-year man can be nearly as complete and finished as that of the four-year man. My case covers that class of men who are not absolutely dependent on themselves to earn a living immediately after graduation."

Another correspondent, a Boston lawyer of power and of first-rate associations, writes:

"Taking so large a number of courses in the regular way ties a man down pretty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tightly to routine college work, and prevents his doing outside work along such lines as his fancy dictates, for the pleasure there is in it, as well as cutting him off from a great deal of social life or athletic activity. In other words, it has a distinct tendency to narrow his sphere of college activity, and cuts down the line of his development to one direction, namely, class-room work. The year that is lost in the three-year course is the fourth year, which is generally the most valuable."

These writers express a truth which every college man knows, namely, that work done under pressure and with intensity is liable to be done in a narrow spirit and with narrowness of intellectual result, although these disadvantages are accompanied by certain advantages.

The longer period, too, is of peculiar value to those men who are slow of development. Such men are more numerous than is usually supposed. They do not find themselves, they do not come to themselves, until the last half of the college course. To them the freshman year is the continuation of the senior year of the fitting school. The sophomore year shows some signs of development. The junior year gives evidence of increasing power. But it is only in the last year that these men really prove the worth of the stuff which is in them. Every college officer knows of scores of such sluggish men. It would be a misfortune, some would say it would be a shame or a sin, to deprive these slow-growing plants of a fitting opportunity for development. In most colleges, the last half of the course is, for these slow-moving men, the period of blossoming and of fruitage. Any cutting off from the length of the college course would mean to them the cutting off of that part which is the more valuable.

For the men, too, who go into business a distinct disadvantage lies in the shorter period. The merchant or manufacturer has small opportunities for living what may be called the life of the spirit. He knows better than most college officers can know that the idols of the market contend against the idols of the library. Therefore, it is well, and more than well, for him to put himself while at college into as close relationship as possible with those gods to which he will find it hard in his business life to pay proper devotion. He must make his peace with them in advance; for his absences from their temple will be numerous and prolonged.

I am also sure that for certain men of rare power and endowed with ample means no training can be too long or too rich. I have in mind those men who are to become the leaders of humanity. They represent those radiant souls to whom the race is to look as wrecked sailors look at the stars. Freed from the necessity of earning a living, and blessed with rich personal endowment as well as with many objective advantages,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are trustees of the highest interests of humanity. If they become physicians, they embody in themselves the right and duty of research. If they become lawyers, they are students of the science and history of law, and not practitioners of its art. If they choose a life of leisure, they use leisure as an opportunity for doing noblest things for the community — things which possibly no one else would do, and which the community as at present organized can hardly do for itself. They are trustees for the race, genuine shepherds of the people. For these men should be provided the richest cultivation during a prolonged period.

Therefore, the sum of this study of the shortened college course, based primarily upon the declarations of men who have taken it, is that the length of the course may be properly made to depend on the man himself. Of course, he is to be so wise that he can properly judge this important question. In case he himself lacks this proper wisdom, he is yet to have wisdom sufficient to secure a wise judgment from others. The conclusion is that the elective principle should be applied to the time a man spends in college as well as to the studies which he pursues. This is the conclusion which, in a recent number of the "Harvard Crimson," Mr. Charles Eliot Norton states as his judgment. He says:

"It has long seemed to me desirable that a free choice should be given to the undergraduates whether to obtain the degree of A. B. by a three or a four years' course of study. A capable and industrious student can accomplish, without serious difficulty, in three years the required number of courses for a degree, and for various and sufficient reasons many students desire to do so. For a great proportion of the undergraduates three years are now, under the actual conditions of life, as long a period as can be profitably spent by them in the undergraduate department, while the graduate school affords opportunity for all who desire (whether with or without regard to a professional career), to pursue liberal studies for a longer time."

It would be well, indeed, for some men to spend five years in college; for in five years they would secure a result no richer than others may secure in three. The man, too, who can get as much in three years as another can in five should not always be content with his three; for the difficulty is not that he is getting enough, but that the five-year man is getting too little. Each man in college, therefore, should elect that the length of his course shall be such as will give the best results not only in relation to the college, but also in relation to his whole life and career. There is no magic about a four-years' course. A four-years' course does not belong to the laws of nature or to the categories of the human understanding. The principle of individuality should be made to apply to this phase of education as to every other phase of education and of life.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## THE CORRUPTING POWER OF PUBLIC PATRONAGE.

FROM the commencement of our government, the question of the appointment and removal of civil employees has harassed and annoyed those charged by the people with the administration of public affairs, and at times has greatly embarrassed and seriously menaced the successful determination and execution of great governmental policies and public undertakings. The makers of the Constitution realized the danger that must threaten a republican government, should the subordinate offices become the spoils of partisan victory; and after many days' debate as to whether the power of appointment should be vested in the two Houses of Congress, or solely with the Executive, or with the Executive and the Senate jointly, they finally determined on the latter course. They provided certain other limitations on the power of appointments to office, such as:

"No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office."

These limitations were wise, but not far-reaching enough to guard against the dangerous abuse of the power of patronage.

In spite of occasional charges of such abuse, the small number of removals made during the first six administrations is evidence that no serious abuses were permitted during the first forty years of the government's existence. Early in the eighteenth century Aaron Burr, who then dominated the politics of the State of New York, introduced the spoils system in that State; and when his pupil and follower, Mr. Van Buren, became Secretary of State, in the Jackson Administration, he inaugurated for the first time the policy that to the victors belong the spoils of office. This system, in spite of various efforts at reform, dominated our civil service until the Trumbull resolutions were passed on March 3, 1871; but it was not until the Pendleton Bill became a law, in January, 1883, that the abuses inaugurated fifty years before were seriously checked and partially reformed.

I do not expect to drift into a statement of the serious influence of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spoils system on the government, but a few instances may not be out of place. In 1825, before the inauguration of the spoils system, the civil expenditures amounted to $11,490,000; in 1833, after its inauguration, they reached a total of $22,713,000, with a corresponding increase of the number of officers dependent on the government. In the succeeding years three collectors of the port of New York defaulted in amounts aggregating over $2,000,000, and down to the appointment of Mr. Arthur, in 1871, the New York Custom House was a seething mass of corruption and abuse of power.

Although the abuses that once existed have been checked by the present Civil Service Commission, there are still many flagrant violations of the law taking place every day. So long as it is left optional with the several heads of departments to select from three names certified to them from the Civil Service Commission, or to reject the entire list without giving a trial to the men thus certified, there is bound to be more or less partisan politics shown in the selections. The result is that a new Administration succeeding one of the opposite party will surely find the great majority of the civil service positions in the hands of its political opponents; and a cry will be raised by its own partisans for an equal distribution of the places, which of necessity will destroy any civil service system ever created.

I did not, however, commence this article with the intention of discussing the evils or shortcomings of our present system, but rather to call attention to the dangerous influence exerted by the spoils system on the legislation of the country. You sometimes hear some blatant reviler of the characters of other men, who has never had an opportunity of gaining correct information, denounce senators and representatives in Congress as guilty of corruption and other high crimes and misdemeanors. I do not contend that corrupt men do not sometimes enter Congress, just as occasionally you find corrupt men in the churches, or in the professions, or among business men; but I do say, after six years' service in the House of Representatives, that I have never heard of any member of Congress being corrupted by the use of money. Taking the 357 representatives as a whole, I am sure that their moral character will not suffer in a comparison with that of the same number of citizens chosen as you come to them from any religious denomination in the land. This of necessity is so. The American people are an honest, God-fearing constituency; and, as a rule, the men they send to represent them reflect their moral character as well as their views on great political questions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wherein, then, is the complaint? It is that the pressure brought by the people at home on their representatives to secure offices for them gives the executive branch of the government a dangerous power in influencing legislation.

A new Administration is returned to power. Mr. Blank belongs to the same party as the President-elect. He probably comes to Washington with campaign pledges to honor; or, if he has been wise and made no ante-election promises, he has many true and tried friends and political followers who are justly entitled to his support, and for whom he desires to obtain some of the appointive offices. The new Administration has a policy it desires to carry out, which requires legislation, and bills are, therefore, introduced by the party leader. Mr. Blank finds that some of these measures are not to the interest of his constituency; or, as a man of independent thought, he conscientiously believes they will not be beneficial to the country. He calls on the Cabinet officers to secure his friend's appointment. He is met with pleasant words, and is told that his friend seems to be well endorsed, but that the matter cannot be determined at present.

Mr. Blank is then asked what he thinks in regard to the Administration measures. The member of the Cabinet is greatly astonished that he cannot support the Administration, and asks him to read somebody's report, and consider it from the standpoint of a party man, etc. After he has made his fourth or fifth call, with the same result, he will begin to hear from his friend, who tells him that congressmen from adjacent districts have received appointments, and that the people at home cannot understand why he cannot do something for his district. The question that he has now to decide is whether he shall submit to become a tool in the hands of the Administration, secure the offices, and drift with the party tides, or whether he shall be a representative of the people, determining for himself what best conserves their interest and meets the demands of justice and right. To do this he must return to face angry friends, and must meet the opposition of an unfriendly Administration. Within the last four years I have seen at least two men of great ability retire from public life rather than surrender their own individuality; being unwilling to remain and contend against a hostile Administration. When the Porto Rican bill was first reported to the House, over thirty members of the Administration party declared themselves against it; but as the debate progressed it was understood by all that the Administration whip was being brought into use to bring the recalcitrants into line. One of the original opponents had the courage to announce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

openly that he had changed his views because the President had requested him to do so. And, on the final vote, only eight had the courage to support their original conviction.

I do not wish to be understood, from what I have said above, as contending that the present Administration alone is responsible for this state of affairs. It has existed with all parties and all administrations almost since the beginning of the government. All that I contend is that from decade to decade it has grown worse instead of better.

If the Democratic party has stood for one thing more than another, it has been for a policy of opposition to a permanent increase of the standing army; yet I have seen the solid phalanx of the opposition in the House of Representatives broken, in the passage of an army bill, by the distribution of patronage. When the cry for place is heard from the editor's son, the banker's son, the lawyer's son, the farmer's son — in truth, everybody's son — the guardian of the liberties of the people, the keeper of the public treasury, must, indeed, be a bold man. The bill providing for the holding of an International Exposition at St. Louis and that creating a Spanish War Claims Commission were passed, after being at first defeated, by making the Commission non-partisan, so that the advocates of the bills secured a number of candidates for the places from almost every State, to work on their home delegations. The fact that a member of Congress is regarded as the means through which patronage is distributed has so affected legislation as to cause the unnecessary expenditure of millions of dollars and the passage of bills that otherwise would never have become law.

The framers of the Constitution contemplated that the legislative branch of the government should be separate and distinct from the executive, in order that one might be a check upon the other. This was a wise provision; and, if our government is to last, it must be guarded with the utmost care. It can only be done by prohibiting by law the representative of the people from having any voice in the appointment of the governmental offices, either directly or indirectly, and making him ineligible for an appointive office under the government for at least two years after the term for which he has been elected has expired. Make his sole business that of legislation, let all fear of punishment or hope of reward come only from his constituency, and the majesty of the people as the rulers of this country will be maintained.

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## HIGHER TECHNICAL TRAINING.

THOSE who compare the industrial development of Europe and America and the educational advances made to influence this development cannot fail to discover our shortcomings in the one as well as in the other. There can be no doubt as to the readiness of our manufacturers to introduce improved methods and the willingness of our working people to adapt themselves to them. On the other hand, European countries possess the advantage of inherent skill in their working classes, transmitted by inheritance, so to speak, in industries rooted for generations in the same locality. What seems of greatest importance, however, is the endeavor of European governments to augment by educational establishments the effectiveness of this adaptability. Technical and industrial art schools are considered the best means of furthering this end; and they have been introduced to the great advantage of the industries of European countries. Our own shortcomings in regard to manufactures are so apparent that efforts toward higher technical training may be looked upon as a national necessity.

This, in brief, was the substance of my findings as embodied in a report made to Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State, after a visit to Germany for the purpose of investigating the differences in technical and industrial fields as between America and European countries.[1] In the spring following, a special commission was extended to me for the study of the condition and progress of technical education and the status of the economy of production, in Europe.

A report on "Industrial Education in France," published by the State Department in 1888, gave a description of the educational system of France. That country was selected for a basis, because a system of public instruction, applying new principles, had been created there, with the express aim of equipping the workers with all the facilities which the experience of ages had contributed to the arts and manufactures. The kindergarten, the primary and secondary schools, the high schools, and the colleges all aim at making the eye the instrument by which the

[1] See Consular Reports, No. 72, December, 1886.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind is trained. Drawing and manual training form an essential part of the curriculum through all the grades. Special trade schools are established for the various lines of industries not only in Paris, but in other towns where their want is felt.

The inquiry, however, was planned on a much broader basis. The first part was to be followed by reports on technical education in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Great Britain. Another report for which material had been collected was to deal with the methods employed in production in different countries. "It will be readily understood," it was stated, "that the inquiry must be extended over the same field in the United States. A general review will then enable us to perceive whatever may be of advantage for us to adopt."[1]

A change in the administration prevented the execution of the work as outlined. The first part was the only part issued. Secretary Bayard, in a letter dated December 14, 1888, asked Congress for an appropriation of $10,000, to make the completion of the work possible. He stated:

> "The work in question consists of facts, not opinions, and the object has been to supply authentic and valuable information for the instruction and benefit of the people of the United States, and especially those engaged in, or contemplating, manufacturing industries. The volume already published will enable an intelligent estimate to be formed of the method under which the information has been procured, the facts deducible, and the general utility and value of the work."

The matter fell through, however, on account of the opposition of the protectionists. The most biassed interpretation was given to this work, which had been undertaken by the State Department for the information of all persons engaged in our industries or interested in their development.

What was the reason of this inimical attitude? Why this strenuous opposition to the diffusion of information on the vexed and complicated industrial and economic problems that were confronting us? Was the pillar of protectionism threatened by the statement, confirmed from time to time by the evidence of special reports, that our superior working capacity and our quicker adoption and fuller utilization of improved machinery enabled us to produce as cheaply as, and in many instances more cheaply than, European countries, with their lower rate of wages and lower standard of living? This investigation made havoc with that bulwark of protectionism, the pauper labor theory. The grounds on which a system of onerous taxation was permitted to stand were shown to be fictitious. Enlightenment, naturally, was considered dangerous by

[1] See Report on Technical Education in Europe. Department of State, 1888.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the beneficiaries of the system. The illusion had to be maintained at all costs, notwithstanding the story told by the steamers loaded down to the keel with the products of our highly paid labor.

But what of the schools and institutes of learning created all over the industrial districts of Europe in aid of their industries? Were they not worth studying? Was it not worth while to learn of the means employed by governments to assist in the struggle for superiority in the industrial field or for the maintenance of positions already gained? The world was awake to the importance of this subject. Was the knowledge of the practice of foreign countries to be included in the list of excluded imports? England had appointed commissions, and other governments had followed suit. Even Russia had made steps in advance in some directions.

Distant Japan, but yesterday awakened from her mediæval sleep, had sent out commissioners to learn how best to adopt or improve the methods employed by Western nations in making learning the handmaid of industry. Her wonderful school exhibit in 1889, at the Paris exposition, revealed to the world what might be expected in the future from the island empire of the Pacific. It attracted the attention of visitors of all classes, from the rural districts no less than from the towns. Here was a nation showing by her exhibit that her workers were unequalled in skill and taste by the most advanced nations of Europe. The blend and richness of its colors, the softness in the texture of its silks, whether in weighty fabrics or in the lighter tissues, its cloisonné vases of exquisite beauty, such as we never see exhibited to the public gaze in our shops or museums, and its metal work and ivory carvings, attracted well-merited admiration. A thousand years of hereditary adaptation have given the Japanese workman such a dexterity of hand and such an eye for color and æsthetic properties that, with the simplest tools, often of his own manufacture, he produces those inimitable objects of skill which force us to acclaim him our past master in the industrial arts. Had Japan elected to rest with self-complacency where she stood twenty-five years ago, she would at least have been able to put forward, in vindication of her position, achievements of the kind here briefly touched upon.

But she has selected the opposite course. Her high schools of learning, her universities, and her technical schools have been established on the most advanced plans. The programmes sent to the exposition included all branches of study. The examination papers showed how the rising generation of Japan had grappled with the new conditions. The students of the University of Tokio contributed papers on chemistry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and mechanics written in French and in English. One paper, written in German, treated of the history of the Hohenstaufen; another, written in English, dealt with an episode of English history; and a third described in French the crusades of St. Louis. Among other exhibits were physical and chemical apparatus made by the pupils of the higher technical schools. It is considered of great importance in a country situated as Japan is, that the scientist who is called upon to labor in localities where the necessary instruments are wanting or deficient should be capable of extricating himself by self-help out of his difficulty. Still, with all this equipment denoting mental capacity of the highest order, Japan is alert in her search for information wherever there is room for improvement. To let well alone is to abdicate one's position.

There was a time when industry was ahead of the schools. The Industrial Museum of Lyons shows a collection of silk tissues covering every period from the introduction of the industry into Europe down to the present day. The earliest specimens are Byzantine from the fourth or fifth century of our era. We can read the industrial history of the centuries by looking at the objects in glass cases. We see how culture proceeded from the Orient to the Occident. Egypt, Moresque Spain and Sicily, Venice, Lombardy, Burgundy, Flanders, France — all these in their turn handed down the sceptre of commerce and of power, wrapped in the products of industrial arts, in the line of succession as intimated here. But it was the view of the curator of the museum, who had spent his life and his private fortune in the collection of these treasures, that the beauty and perfection of the work and its richness of color had retrograded with the progress of time. A far less cultivated eye had received the same impression.

The workman of ancient and mediæval times mastered his art in all its details. His work was part of himself. Where to-day a dozen different trades combine in the production of a piece of tissue, then one hand manipulated all or nearly all the operations from the plain thread to the finished product. When a progressive step in mechanical devices or in chemical invention could be made only at the risk of the inventor's neck, the preservation of methods was a necessary result. Machine employment could not develop under the hangman's threat. The principle that ruled industry was the very opposite of that which rules it to-day. Intensity speaks out of every fibre in the fabrics of the past as well as out of every detail of the smith's work in gold, silver, or iron, while the paling effect of extensiveness in the products of the present time cannot be concealed by the most ingenious artifices.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From this point of view nothing can ever take the place of the hand worker. The machine-driven loom can never give the suppleness to the fabric that distinguishes a *crêpe-de-chine*, nor could all the arts of Europe and America combined produce a square yard of work equal to the exquisite beauty, in color, design, and clinging softness, seen in an India shawl. Not all our learning could enable an adept of one of our most celebrated schools or workshops to turn out a carpet or a rug such as is produced in Daghestan or Persia. Yet all this is the work of uneducated peasants, who might possibly be discomfited if they were examined in the three R's.

This work stands in about the same relation to the best that our factories turn out as that in which the Madonna di San Sisto stands toward the Madonnas of present-day painters or of the copyists who would reproduce the cinque-cento picture. The contours are there, but the depth and warmth of feeling are wanting that give expression to a masterpiece of religious art. All our training has not been able to create a Jamnitzer or Cellini in the goldsmith's art. An age without imagination cannot supply more than what is acquired by the plodding, mechanical minds of our present art-workers.

In the manufacturing industries work has become decentralized, and has lost its connecting link. The industrial worker coöperating in the production of an article has not the slightest interest in the ultimate use of that part on which he is engaged. The principle of the division of labor is carried to the minutest detail. Every step in the industrial progression is marked by the application of specially devised machinery. An immense output is the only object of this constantly grinding mechanism. Now, where the efficiency of the individual working hand is measured by the number of spindles, looms, or tool machines he is able to manage, or the number of yards, pieces, or pounds he is able to turn out in a given period, the perfection of the work is dependent more on that of the system than on that of the individual engaged in any special manipulation.

The creation of schools becomes essential under this new dispensation in the same proportion as the worker loses his connection with the work, and becomes practically a part of the mechanism he supervises. Instead of being a worker he is now a tender, an attendant. In the textiles he has become a splicer of threads; in the mechanics an oiler of journals and gearings, or an adjuster of materials and beltings. Even when a finished product is finally to emerge from this babel of parts, the idea is removed from the worker to the office. But whoever is re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsible for it, the flaws in the material, in the thread, or in the coloring cannot in the slightest degree be concealed when the article goes into the market to seek a purchaser.

Americans have always shown great expertness in the manufacture of wearing apparel for men and women. White cotton underwear for women, though richly trimmed with lace and embroidery, which pays a fine of sixty per cent at the custom-house for the crime of being of foreign origin, has found markets in Canada and England. Of late years the manufacture of shirt-waists for women has grown to immense proportions. An attempt to open connections in England proved for a time eminently successful. The tastefulness of the articles produced was recognized on all sides, and large orders were obtained. But after one successful season the business collapsed. This was mainly due to the inferiority of the materials used. The uneven threads produced an uneven fabric, and the dyes and color blends could not satisfy the eyes that were accustomed to the exquisite work produced in ginghams in Scotland and the finer prints of Mülhausen and Manchester. But to pay forty, fifty, or sixty per cent duty on these, to manufacture them here, and to re-export them to England, where in the meantime people had learned a thing or two from our own methods, was of course, out of the question. No other cause than that of inferiority of fabrics can possibly be adduced for the stagnant and even retrogressive figures of our exports of cotton goods to countries which are our very next-door neighbors. To examine the products of English, German, and French looms is to comprehend this fact in all its bearings. It is the constant endeavor of the governments of those countries to enable their industries to supply under the new development all that was formerly given to the fabrics by workers of special fitness and application.

It would be an error to suppose that all manufacturing industries are now subject to the régime of division of labor. Many of them cannot be conducted on this plan, and a great deal of work has therefore to follow the ancient course; the hand of the worker being assisted, however, by more or less improved mechanical appliances. But in all cases the idea to be embodied is that of shape or ornament, which has to be rendered by color or design. The artistic idea can no more be dissociated from a piece of printed calico than from a vase or from the portico of a temple.

When England discovered in 1851, at her first world exhibition, that the condition of her artistic development was liable to endanger her trading eminence, she did not hesitate long in determining on the proper

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remedy. She adopted the only possible means of raising the industrial standard, namely, the creation of art schools and museums. In spite of all the efforts subsequently made by other nations in that direction the South Kensington Institute is still unrivalled to-day. It is unnecessary to speak of the vast resources of its museum, which is known the world over as a treasure-house of ancient, mediæval, and modern art. Weeks of study can be profitably spent in its extensive galleries. Any one who desires ideas and models from which to work out designs for his trade or art can find ready for his service the noblest objects which the world has ever produced and time has not destroyed. The institute has all over the world agents who are instructed to buy up specimens worthy to adorn its halls. Its operations do not end here. Every English town that aspires to the distinction of having an art museum or that is already in possession of one can be supplied with circulating loan exhibits, which remain for a certain period, after which they are exchanged for other objects, under the advice of the master of the art school usually connected with the museum. In this manner an interest is kept up in the art museums of these provincial manufacturing towns. But many of these have museums of their own of a character that would quite astonish those who lavish terms of admiration upon collections like those of the New York Metropolitan Museum, the Boston Museum of Art, or the Philadelphia collection of objects of industrial art. The Birmingham Museum is especially rich in specimens of industrial skill of rare beauty, more or less related to the industries of the town. These museums are generally the depositories of rich private collections, originally placed there as loan exhibits, but in most cases ultimately becoming bequests.

The most important museums of Germany are usually the collections of princely or royal houses, supplemented for generations by their art-loving scions. The National Museum at Munich and the Germanic Museum at Nuremberg could hardly be excelled for the historical interest of their collections in industrial art. Possessing a wealth of precious and beautiful objects, they lack, however, the variety and comprehensiveness of the British collections. Special efforts are being made to establish museums in industrial centres, where, of course, prominence is given to the articles chiefly manufactured in the district.

Art teaching in the United Kingdom is rooted in the general system emanating from South Kensington. This is held by many to smack too much of a cut-and-dried system. I did not find, however, that an able head-master lacked sufficient freedom, within a certain general line of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rules, to develop incipient talent to very good fruition. The specialization of teaching to serve the industrial centre where the schools are located would in itself be a powerful help toward a somewhat free exercise of individuality.

The liberal distribution of these schools to suit the purposes of manufacturing industries is illustrated by the fact that North Staffordshire has an art school in each of the five towns that form the Pottery district. These towns now extend so far that it is difficult to say where one begins or the other ends, and all are connected by tram-cars and steam. The great benefit which local industries receive from this widely extended art teaching, supported by a wealth of objects of art, selected for their beauty, is clearly shown in this case. Minton, Doulton, Wedgwood, and Royal Worcester wares are known the world over. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, they cannot complain of lack of appreciation. They are copied extensively by German manufacturers, who, as is usual with imitators, leave out of the design the more expensive work, producing a very similar article at a considerably lower figure. The English do not seem to relish this kind of martyrdom. Yet it cannot be dissociated from the palm of originality.

Perhaps no single object has given to art industry higher inspiration and better commercial results than that unapproached gem in ground glass work, the Portland Vase. Whoever understands the technical difficulties in grinding a group of figures out of two adhering glass layers of a disc will understand the magnitude of the undertaking when the same operation has to be performed on a heavy round object like a vase. Yet the master hand that wrought the design accomplished it without a flaw. As the years roll on, countless imitations of this work are produced in clay and glass, from the cameo plaque and the paste-on-paste down to the Wedgwood and their imitators' processes in laid-on ornament from moulds. I was shown by the director of the Royal Worcester works a Japanese vase in cloisonné, not more than nine or ten inches high, for which he had paid 160 guineas. One could see in its exquisite lines of ornamentation the origin of the highly prized pieces of this world-renowned factory. To these directors no price is too high for a truly valuable piece on which to feed the imagination of their designers. Indeed, without this support of the object world in art, art teaching would remain dry and barren.

Art teaching in France is known to be of a very high order, and is conducted systematically. Perhaps one of the best features of the system is the annual reunion of art teachers in Paris. Provincial art teachers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have their expenses paid by the government if they wish to attend these assemblies. A main object associated with these reunions is the opportunity they give for visiting the galleries and art exhibitions of Paris.

Technical education is a very comprehensive term. It includes in its range all branches of instruction calculated to further the productive processes. Forced by the exigencies of the situation, we have advanced, within the life of this generation, to the head of the nations in engineering work and in machine construction. The high rate of wages ruling in this country, a condition beyond cavil and debate, made the application of labor-saving machinery a self-evident necessity. The inventor had a profitable field for the employment of all his latent ingenuity, the inheritance of a race just emerged from the task of subduing a continent. With our achievements in hand as proof of our mastery it would be futile to spend words on this branch of the field of technical education. Quantitatively, production has nowhere else received the impetus it is receiving in the United States. In this survey special reference need, therefore, be made only to the advantages extended by schools to industries wherein skill and taste will always remain the determining features and the creators of values.

*L'école d'horlogerie*, of Geneva, supplies the best model for the school of a district whose industry has to grapple alike with the new and with the old system of work. While instruction is given in such a thorough manner that the pupil is trained to make by hand all the parts of a watch or chronometer from the crude materials, he is at the same time instructed in all the details of the complicated machinery employed in watch-making. Machine construction, so far as watch-making is concerned, is a special part of the school plan. An interesting school worthy of equal study by our manufacturing art-industries is the *École des arts industriels* at Geneva. Design and practical execution in bronze, clay, marble, and decorative ironwork speak of effective teaching. The productions are of a high character, and always find ready purchasers. There are few prominent centres devoted to art industries in Germany that are not supported by more or less well-equipped schools. In the metallic branches, however, I could not find any as thoroughly organized for the putting of theory into working practice as the two here mentioned, excepting perhaps the *Königliche Industrieschule* at Munich, where practical training is carried to a high degree.

Close attention is paid in Germany to technical education in the textile industries. In fabrics color is, next to design, the breath-giving force. Chemistry has wrested the sceptre from nature's hand. The colors which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not creations of the laboratory are few indeed. Germany has for years held undisputed mastery in the color industries. Her universities teach the science of their production without special regard to their application. This assures at all times a succession of capable teachers and experts, devoted to original research. The polytechnic schools instruct in the sciences as applied to industry. They vie with the universities to attract to themselves the best professorial talent. The director of the *Eidgenössische Polytechnicum* at Zurich complained to me that he had but recently lost two of his best professors because, owing to the poverty of Switzerland, his school could not possibly pay the salaries offered in Germany for high chemical talent. One of these professors had accepted a call to Göttingen at a salary of 30,000 marks, and another to Munich with 50,000 marks for life. The highest salary they could pay in Zurich was 10,000 francs. This may seem an extravagant statement; but when we consider the high salaries paid to expert chemists by the Ludwigshafen, Elberfeld, and other color and dye works, the matter loses its aspect of improbability. As this munificence is far beyond Germany's usual attitude toward her officials, it shows plainly what her views are with regard to the fructifying effect upon industry of a thorough training. We can easily see the result of applying this principle of the economy of high wages to these industries, absolutely the creation of the brain, by which hundreds of millions of marks are produced from the refuse heaps of coal. Germany's exports in coal-tar colors and aniline dyes amount to about 80,000,000 marks a year.

None of the color works of prominence has less than a dozen highly remunerated expert chemists in its employ, and no outlay is deemed too high to secure a new discovery. Years of investigation in the laboratory without visible results are not considered wasted in view of the general utility of research. The chief chemists receive a share in the profits in addition to their salaries. However, the annual dividends declared demonstrate the wisdom of this policy.

But this is only the higher stratum. The special schools conduct laboratory work to meet the requirements of the industries for whose support they have been founded. The best organized school is the Royal Weaving School of Crefeld, with its annex, the Dyeing and Finishing Department. This school is chiefly devoted to silk, though all other textiles receive attention in the theoretical courses. Its resources include a rich collection of textiles and a large library of books and illustrations to assist in the teaching of design. As in Lyons, the pupils are expected to collect flowers and plants for the designs they have in hand.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Attention is likewise given to machine drawing, and workshop practice in woodwork is compulsory. The pupils make the wooden patterns for the silk machinery, the castings of which are, however, made outside, and practise the mounting and taking apart of looms, etc. The object is to make them expert in the repairing and handling of every loom and working machine that may in the future come under their hands.

It is needless to say that every kind of machinery required in bringing the thread from the cocoon to its final condition in thread-dyed, piece-dyed, or printed fabrics is assigned liberal representation in the well-arranged and spacious workrooms. It is the policy of the school to possess a specimen of every loom of good repute, and every new invention is subjected to a full test, giving thereby not a little help to the Crefeld manufacturers. At the time of my visit the school owned about eighty looms of different kinds, including several examples of a Russian invention easily workable by foot-power and intended to be used against the power loom. Though sixty of them were used in a neighboring factory with satisfactory results, the director's opinion was that the loom would not make much headway, as it required very expert weavers, and because the small power motors made it possible to run power looms in the hands of weave-masters at a trifling expense. The district from Crefeld to Elberfeld and up to the small metal goods country — Iserlohn, Remscheid, Solingen — is now so fully supplied with electric power, made serviceable to the old home-industries, that we see here as a sign of the times of no small importance a decentralization of industries progressively sustaining itself against the aggressive competition of the capitalistically organized power-mill.

That the Dyeing and Finishing School is of the highest merit is attested by the great demand for its graduates at home and abroad. A thorough theoretical and practical course is given in all branches of chemistry applied to practical life. The color industries, dyeing, bleaching, stuff-printing by hand and rollers, finishing, the manufacture and character of dyes and colors, the mordants, the behavior of the different textiles toward coloring matters, the analysis of water and its purification — all these are subjects of theoretical teaching, supported by direct manipulation in the laboratories and workrooms.

I might say a few words about the textile school of Müilheim on the Rhine, which holds high rank in the opinion of manufacturers of cotton goods. Schools at Mülhausen in Elsass, at Dresden, and at Chemnitz would deserve mention as assisting the representative textile industries of these localities. But as none of them holds rank with the Crefeld

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school, the subject has received sufficient treatment when the most prominent one has been brought to the attention of the American reader.

It is not to be supposed that England has not exerted herself in the establishment of similar schools, though none of them equals the Crefeld school. The Bradford Technical College and the Yorkshire College at Leeds give close attention to practical instruction in all branches of scientific training helpful to the woollen and worsted industries. The Owens College in Manchester and the Mason Science College in Birmingham have a beneficial influence upon the industries of these centres. The same may be said of Nottingham University College. Workshop practice is carried on through the courses in machine building as well as in industries more closely connected with the respective towns. While these colleges are not able to cope with the technical school mentioned above, the introduction of these trade specialties into their courses shows the effort they are making not to neglect the important point, that learning must have a practical end if it is to be of any use in the economics of the people. The examination papers at these institutions testify that every year an amount of trained talent of no mean order is being diffused among the industries of England.

Americans could pick up many suggestions of the highest value without crossing the Channel or the Rhine. The work of the "City and Guilds of London Institute for the Advancement of Technical Education" is making a valuable contribution to the spread of technical training, and is producing gratifying results. This institute occupies the same position toward trade and manufactures that South Kensington occupies toward art instruction, and the Science Department toward science schools. It sends out examiners, and conducts examinations on the results of which grants are given to teachers, and prizes and scholarships to pupils. Its diplomas of efficiency and graduation are highly valued, and always secure good appointments to their possessors. The examinations cover no less than thirty-five trades and manufacturing industries. Directly subordinated to, and forming a part of, the Institute are the Central Institution, on Exhibition Road, in the West End, and the Finsbury College, in the Eastern district. The former is a higher college, with the object of training persons to become technical teachers, or to enter industrial or professional careers. The Finsbury College aims to prepare persons of either sex for intermediate posts in industrial management and for the courses at the Central Institution.

I should not do justice to this subject did I not refer, if only in the briefest manner, to the efforts that are being made in the direction of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher commercial education. Paris has three commercial colleges, the most important of which is the *École des hautes études commerciales*, one of the best in France, in the Boulevard Malesherbes, while that in Bordeaux deserves more than passing mention. But in this respect Germany is probably foremost among commercial nations. The commercial languages of the world, political economy and commercial law, banking and finance, the trade habits and productive facilities of various countries, are among the leading subjects of instruction. The high reputation gained by several of the commercial high schools of Germany has not been sufficient to deter the Government from endeavoring to extend their reach, as has been demonstrated of late by the creation of two commercial universities. A new departure has thus been made which has raised learning in the practical branches of everyday life to the dignity that was heretofore enjoyed by the old classical studies only. A similar striving for advancement is visible in all the departments of knowledge which minister to art and industry.

If we now ask what America has been doing, we must confess that the field is as bare in all these particulars as it was a dozen years ago. We are striving with might and main to occupy a leading position as exporters of manufactures. But if we had the goods which the world demands, how would young men of American education be qualified to sell them? Proficiency in Spanish would certainly be of the highest utility in connection with our recent acquisitions; but this language has scarcely a place in our colleges. Any one of the Latin tongues is a help to the acquisition of any of the sister languages; but how many of a thousand graduates of college and university master French enough to be able to express themselves in that language with any fluency?

Commercial schools have no room allotted to them in our educational system in spite of its vast outlay. Owing to their ignorance of the language of the country, our salesmen and buyers when sent to foreign markets are in the hands of the local commissionaires, unless they have received a foreign business education. Our manufacturers testify to the absurd inadequacy of our educational facilities by their employment of foreigners, largely English, in intermediate positions, as overseers and managers. Our silk manufacturers draw their best talent from men educated in the Crefeld school. Many of them have themselves gone through its courses, and are sending their sons to enjoy the same advantage. A few men scattered here and there can scarcely build up an industry. Unless we can distribute educated talent through all the departments in dyeing, finishing, and the intermediate processes, we may boast of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quantities of silk annually thrown on the market, but our products will not rise above their present standard. The deficiency in color and finish, when a comparison is made with the rich hues of foreign fabrics, is too apparent to require comment.

Our tariff, by excluding foreign competition, condemns our industries to æsthetic inertia. An attempt to reach higher ideals of perfection is unnecessary where the law assures a monopoly of trade. The examples of better foreign work, by which taste is diffused and stimulated, are absent, and producer and consumer alike become satisfied with "good enough" because "better" is unknown. This makes it all the more necessary to create vehicles for the spread of knowledge in art and science, and opportunities for high technical training in industries which depend entirely on taste as their spark of life. Whatever we do must start from the standpoint of art — the æsthetic idea. Mere weaving schools would give our manufacturers good loom fixers and overseers, but would leave the actual products in the same unattractive condition.

Millions upon millions are annually expended by munificent donors on universities and colleges. The golden rain never reaches the parched ground which most needs it. We cannot well appeal to the state for so necessary an aid to our industrial development. We should be speaking to deaf ears. Our manufacturers are only beginning to understand how the industries to which they owe their fortunes would profit from the higher training of the workers. They prefer to exploit in their own mills the highly educated talent of European countries rather than to create schools at home. Those who are able to avail themselves of this advantage would rather see the utilization of this talent confined to the few than have schools at home distribute this knowledge over the whole industrial sphere.

As far as I know, the only school that has taken any steps toward bridging the gulf is the Philadelphia Textile School. I visited it in 1888, and again quite recently, and found on my second visit that considerable progress had been made during the interval. It is established on a very promising basis. Its central thought is the æsthetic idea, with which the technical branches are coördinated. But its means are limited, and the support it receives from manufacturers is *nil*.

A few millions would not be misspent in bringing to its full growth an establishment based on the proper foundations. A manifold return would be made for all the sums spent on museums, laboratories, and lecture-rooms. It goes without saying that such an institution cannot be established except in a large centre of population of metropolitan char-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acter, with its artistic and commercial influences. Within the last few years wealth has grown, without effort on the part of its accumulators, so to speak, to dimensions hitherto undreamed of. It is measured by the hundreds of millions now held in single hands. The immensity of such resources must in time become a burden to the possessors. What better method could they find to liberate themselves from the accumulating interest of these huge fortunes, than that of using it in the manner here suggested? It is noble work to give young men that higher training which will enable them to bring to a higher plane of perfection the industries to which they attach themselves, and thus make them truly independent of foreign competition. JACOB SCHOENHOF.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## THE MOVEMENT FOR A SHORTER WORKING-DAY.

THE demand for a shorter working-day, although at the present season more than usually insistent, is one of the oldest features in the programme of organized labor. For a hundred years it has inspired the thought and activity of trade-unionists in the United States. It has held a leading, if not the first, place in the formula of every labor organization that has been formed during that period; it has survived and gathered force when other plans, supposed to be more comprehensive, have failed and have passed from the field of discussion. The effort to lessen the daily hours of labor was one of the earliest fruits of the industrial system under which the "sun to sun" rule prevailed. Having its bases in the intellectual and material needs of the workers, the demand for a shorter working-day has been made with renewed vigor at every epoch in the country's history.

In the first decades of the century, when general poverty and ample opportunity coincided to compel the greatest possible effort, when thirteen and fifteen hours constituted the "normal" working-day, and when women and children were cowhided to their tasks in the factories of New England, the ten-hour movement arose. At the close of the Civil War, when, as a result of the rapid development of the country's manufacturing industries, the first great contrast between riches and poverty presented itself, thus suggesting a potent subject of protest to minds but recently agitated by the question of chattel slavery, the labor organizations again asserted their demand for a reduction of the hours of labor. The result of these efforts, although varying in particular cases, has been a material reduction in the length of the working-day in the general industries of the country. The present movement, then, inspired by developments no less radical than those which have marked preceding industrial epochs, involves but a short and easy step in the transition from the old to the new principle of the normal working-day.

The present nine-hour day movement of the International Association of Machinists is part of the well-defined policy of the organized trades of the United States. Beginning in 1884, three years after its forma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, the American Federation of Labor has followed a systematic plan to reduce the hours of labor in those industries which at a given time are best prepared by organization and other conditions to make a sustained effort. In this way definite shape and effect have been given to the sentiment which was formerly expressed more or less sporadically. Under the system now pursued by the Federation, the particular trade conditions are carefully studied for a year, or, it may be, for a much longer period. The mutual interests of trades and localities are consulted, and all questions which bear directly or indirectly upon any particular case are scrupulously weighed. Funds, in some cases specific, in others general, are raised and appropriated in support of the organization chosen by the annual convention to lead the movement for the reduction of the hours of labor. By this method a number of crafts — notably the cigar-makers, carpenters, and furniture-workers — have reduced the average length of the day's work from ten hours to eight. Thus the movement has proceeded from year to year, with occasional intermissions during periods of great depression.

At the twentieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Louisville, Kentucky, last December, the following resolution was adopted:

"That the President of the American Federation of Labor is hereby instructed to advise all general and local organizers of the American Federation of Labor to assist the International Association of Machinists wherever possible to bring about a more thorough organization of the trade, and to coöperate with and assist the International officers of the above Association to the end that the nine-hour day may be successfully inaugurated."

In accordance with the terms of this resolution, President Gompers and a number of organizers employed by the Federation, in conjunction with the officials of the Machinists, spent several weeks almost exclusively in preparation for the enforcement of the demand, which was made on May 20. In a recent public address, President C'Connell, chief executive of the Machinists, set forth the position of his craftsmen in the statement that, computing the total number of machinists in the country at 150,000, the reduction of the daily hours of labor from ten to nine would give employment to an additional 15,000 men. The effect of the reduction, declared Mr. O'Connell, would be "higher pay, more time out of the shop, and, consequently, more highly developed manhood and more cheerful homes." This statement epitomizes the whole ground upon which rests the movement for a shorter working-day. The justice of that movement, then, depends upon the validity of these claims.

The employment of additional labor as a result of the reduction of



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hours of labor, either directly to maintain the total of the product or indirectly to meet an increased demand, is a necessary assumption in the circumstances. It has been claimed that the length of the working-day may be decreased without necessarily reducing the individual product. But this contention, while probably well founded when made with reference to hand labor, is not maintained when dealing with those crafts in which machinery is extensively used, since the capacity of machinery is governed by mechanical rules. This may be considered granted by both employers and employees. The opposition to the reduction of the hours of labor rests upon the increased cost involved, which is due directly to the employment of additional labor to maintain the total of the product, or indirectly to the enforced stoppage, and consequent depreciation of tools and machinery.

It is understood, of course, that the effort to shorten the working-day presupposes the maintenance of wages at the previously existing figure. The economic issue, therefore, is a question of relatively higher wages, and, consequently, of actual increase in the cost of the product. To this question the trade-unionists reply that the additional cost of the product is more than counterbalanced by the increased demand; and that while the rate of profit may decrease the amount increases. On the other hand, the market price of a commodity, although temporarily or even permanently increased under the shorter working-day system, decreases in proportion to the increase in the consuming power.

This reasoning proceeds upon the rule that wages are regulated not by the length of the working-day, but by the standard of living. Much of the opposition to the reduction of the hours of labor is based upon the common error expressed by the sophism, "Ten hours' pay for nine hours' work." If wages were really paid by the hour, we should find, as a rule, that wages are increased as the working-day is lengthened. It is well known, however, that the opposite condition prevails; that, as between given industries and countries, the longer working-day is invariably distinguished by the lower wage rate. The facts of the movement for a shorter working-day demonstrate that wages increase not only relatively to the amount of work done, but also positively as the result of the diminished competition among the workers. This fact is the strongest possible substantiation of the contention that the wage rate is governed wholly by those considerations which we have in mind when we speak of the "standard of living." "More time out of the shop" means more time for rest and recreation; leading to the creation of new desires, and the consequent elevation, or at least diversification, of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accustomed mode of living. By a natural process these desires become needs the satisfaction of which is as imperative to the sense of decency as is that of the purely physical wants to the maintenance of life itself.

The increased demand for the products of labor serves not only to readjust the relations between wages, cost, and profits, but also to preserve the utility of the so-called labor-saving machine. The value of any improvement in industrial methods must depend upon economizing rather than destroying labor. Ruskin has said, in effect, that economy in money matters consists neither in saving nor in spending, but in using. So it is with the labor-saving machine. This we can see by supposing the case of a machine which would "save" all forms of labor other than those required for its manipulation. Such a machine would be useless, for the reason that if the labor of the world were without the opportunity of application, there could be no demand for its products. In a proportionate degree, the machine-labor system that is conducted with the view of attaining the limit of production with the smallest possible outlay in labor, rather than of conserving a proper balance between the producing and the consuming powers, is necessarily wasteful and self-destructive. Ultimately, the only economy in the use of machinery lies in changing the direction of labor from lesser to larger productive ends.

Possibly there is a point at which, under the operation of "supply and demand," this tendency will correct itself. But why the necessity of continuing toward that point? It may be admitted that the labor displaced by the machine in some industries is partially absorbed in the new openings made by the machine itself. It may even be admitted that in time the machine will have so cheapened production that the increased demand thus invited will recall the amount of labor originally displaced. But in the practical point of view there exists an appreciable and ever-growing residuum of idle men and women whose future is bounded by their personal resources, and to whom, therefore, philosophy and statistics can offer but scant comfort. Practically, so far as the displaced labor of to-day is concerned, demand is a fixed quantity. The purpose of the movement for a shorter working-day is to apply an immediate corrective to the tendency toward the displacement of labor.

Already the industrial pace is telling in the increasing acuteness of the struggle for the world's markets. The bearing of that struggle upon the movement for the reduction of hours is significantly illustrated by the opposition to the National Eight-Hour Bill, which, after passing the House of Representatives of the 55th and 56th Congresses, has been held up in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, at the instance of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government contractors in the ship-building and steel-making industries. These firms reason, quite correctly, that the enforced reduction of hours on government work in any establishment would compel a like reduction on private work. Such, indeed, is the natural and well-understood effect of all legislation on the subject. This tendency has been demonstrated in every instance since President Van Buren, in 1840, signed the first order limiting to ten hours the length of the day's work in the Washington Navy Yard and all other public establishments.

Although the effort to secure legislation limiting the length of the working-day deals primarily with public employees and with the extension of police powers to such private employments as directly menace the health, the moral and economic influence which such legislation exercises upon all classes of labor is fully appreciated. In resisting this influence the government contractors take the ground that the reduction of the hours of labor on private work would place them at a disadvantage in competing with other nations. In a word, the argument against the reduction of hours is an argument in favor of maintaining the power of American labor to underbid the so-called "cheap pauper labor" of Europe.[1] The final outcome of the struggle for American supremacy in competition has been very clearly pointed out in a statement made in a recent publication by the State Department on the subject, as follows:[2]

"There is food for thought also in the possible consequences to our European trade of a rivalry on our part which may be so crushing as greatly to impair the purchasing power of those who are now our best customers. If we permanently cripple their chief industries, we deprive them, to a greater or less extent, of the means of buying from us, and the consumption of our food supplies and our raw materials, as well as of our finished goods, may be greatly curtailed. The solution of the problem may perhaps be found in the gradual specialization of commerce and industry, according to the peculiar capacity of each competing nation — the survival, in other words, of the fittest conditions for this or that country — and the gradual subsidence of competition into *healthful exchange*."

The reasoning upon which this forecast is based has an equally direct, and even more immediate, bearing upon the internal affairs of the country. In the present epoch, therefore, the movement for a shorter working-day appeals with renewed force to the common sense of the workers as a logical and conservative step toward the highest point of production and morals.

WALTER MACARTHUR.

[1] See Senate Document, No. 318, 55th Congress, 2d Session.

[2] "A General Survey of the Foreign Trade," Consular Reports, Feb. 13, 1901.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE ETHICS OF LOOT.

THE coming of the allied forces to Tientsin, Pekin, Pao-ting-fu, and the metropolitan provinces of Chihli has given rise to the use of the Hindustani word "loot," probably from the unique presence of Indian troops. The interest which is displayed the world over in stories of looting is only equalled by the interest which is taken in the actual thing. Generals, governments, ministers plenipotentiary, globe-trotters, war correspondents, soldiers, marines, Cossacks, Sepoys, European ruffians, Chinese converts, missionaries, merchants, lovers of art, adventurers, Chinese *literati*, and western *littérateurs* — even the dull mind of Mark Twain — have all been looting, speculating in looted goods, longing for loot, or diagnosing the right thereof. As a member of one of these classes — I will not say of which kind — I venture to expound the ethics of loot.

Loot means spoils of war. If there has been no war, looting may be set down as wrong. If wrong there has been, it has been in making war, whether by the Chinese imperial government or by the combined troops of Europe, America, and Asia, and not in the incidental result of the collection of spoils.

The Emperor of China, or, more properly speaking, the Dowager Empress, speaking in the name of the sovereign and backed by Manchu noblemen and conservative mandarins, declared war against all outside nations, because the admirals of some of these nations had demanded the surrender of the Taku forts. These admirals were senseless sinners, if there was no reason for their action. Their threat as mere bluster was criminal. They forced the hand of China, and, in so doing, entrapped in the trap of bloodshed, outrage, and malice their own countrymen, not only in Pekin, but in all the provinces of North China. But these warriors of the sea read the times, and were quick to act. Pekin was already cut off from the world by the growing hordes of turbulent Boxers, and the plot was set to move the troops in such a way that Tientsin would be cut off from Taku and the sea, and that the doom of the legations at Pekin would thus be sealed. If wrong there has been, it has been in the indifference to existing friction, a fault of both Chinese and foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers, and in the reliance upon the arts of peace to the exclusion of the art of war.

If the Chinese imperial government — I do not say China — had contented itself with waging war according to recognized usages, China's friends from abroad would have given her help, and would have stood as her advocates in the judicial court of the world. But facts were otherwise. Those representing the sovereignty of this ancient people gave heed to outlaws; spurned sober counsel; trampled on justice; closed the gates of liberty; poured out the revenues to those who sought innocent blood; laughed at the rights of nations and the sacredness of the person of foreign representatives; let loose their vials of wrath, and opened a carnival of hell; defied holy compacts, cherished friendships, humanity, law, retribution, high heaven; sentenced to death every foreigner and every Christian within their borders; turned the prince's palace and the governor's *yamen* into an altar of human sacrifice; poured from the palace itself shot and shell, as well as edict; slaughtered over 240 helpless men, women, and children, who did no harm as they dwelt in the land, and with them over 30,000 native followers of the Christian faith; gloated wildly over their indecencies and pandemonium in their day of strength; and, in their day of weakness, when 40,000 foreign troops — Christian, Hindoo, Buddhist, Mohammedan — came marching on, left their palaces, their people, their blood-stained swords, the throne, the wealth, the confusion, the recompense, and the doom, and fled to the mountains.

For the crime thus committed by the instigation of the Manchu court, it seemed at the moment that no punishment could be too severe. "Raze the city to the ground!" "Burn the palace!" "Let ruins mark the site of the greatest crime of the century, and prove a warning to coming centuries." I am not sure, in the new moments of reflection, after six months of wearying negotiations of peace, with defiance, disdain, callousness, and self-complacency still writ large over every deed of the Dowager Empress and her closest counsellors, but that the first thought, if carried out, would have been for the greatest good of the greatest number. As a mild modification of such drastic proposals there grew up the romantic system of looting.

The first feature of looting may be spoken of as foraging or commandeering for the necessities of the foreign military. Before the arrival of the troops — none too soon for the safety of the besieged legations — every shop in the city had been closed, deserted, or already looted by the native soldiery, the Boxers, or the populace. There was no vegetable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or meat market. Fodder and grain could only be found in the surrounding country, in private houses of the well-to-do, and in a few shops. The foreign houses had all been destroyed, except those in the legation quarter, and even these were unsuited to the immediate needs of the allied forces. Commodious quarters were needed and were taken — the Imperial Carriage Park, the Temple of Heaven, the Temple of Agriculture, the Six Boards, the palaces of several princes, and the residences of wealthy mandarins. Fodder, food, horses, cattle, blankets, clothing, furniture, and dishes were seized according to need, and were distributed among officers and men, until commissariat supplies began to arrive, native shops were opened, and street marketing was resumed. All this was recognized as a legitimate part of campaigning. The only way for the Chinese to have prevented it was never to have gone to war.

Similar to this was the first and principal looting by foreign civilians, including the missionaries, and by the native converts and attendants. The quarters of the British legation had been set apart for nearly two months for the use of over 400 foreigners and nearly that number of Chinese, while in adjoining buildings, sheds, and open courts there were congregated nearly 2,300 Christian refugees. In the buildings connected with the North Cathedral, which was defended by only forty French and Italian marines, were over 3,200 Catholic refugees. When the siege was raised most of these people had to move out, especially those who were quartered on the legations. Their homes were gone, and the houses of others must be occupied, and that at once. Most of the missions sought out quarters sufficient for their converts as well as for the missionaries. The only ones especially lenient were those who had no Chinese to care for. Nearly all who thus took temporary possession of other people's property did so with the special sanction of their ministers and the military. In some cases the houses had been already deserted by their conscience-stricken owners; in other cases the owners offered hospitality to avoid a looting of another kind far more severe.

Properly speaking, such occupation of houses — the billeting of soldiers and missionaries upon the town — is not a case of looting; but the fundamental principle being the same, namely, taking under force of war that which belongs to another, the incident is worth mentioning. A clear case of looting is the taking of grain, rice, fodder, fuel, and clothing from deserted houses and shops. If the task of avoiding famine during the siege was a difficult one, it was almost as difficult to get anything to eat during the first few days after the siege. The obtaining of supplies could not be delayed, unless theory required that those saved during the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siege should die of starvation afterward. As there were no shops open to trade — an outcome of the imperial support of the Boxer rising — there was no payment to be made, and in many cases no one to take a payment. Learned divines trained in the theology of Calvin and Arminius could recall no teaching applicable to these new conditions, and unhesitatingly proceeded to take food wherever found. The kind Dowager Empress forgot to make arrangements for our wants during the siege and after; but during each period we adapted ourselves to circumstances, and got along.

Owing to the fact that two of the missions, both connected with the American Board, succeeded in occupying the palaces of two princes, there arose an opportunity — the only one of a lifetime — to put up for sale looted goods. It is this affair that has made the stir. One prince was of the number of the eight hereditary princes, among whom Prince Chuang was the most notorious; and it seemed to be taken for granted that none of these should be spared, or that they at least should suffer before the common people. The other prince was a Mongol, who lived adjoining the destroyed premises of the American Board, and whose palace had been turned into Boxer headquarters. Within a day after the siege was raised, Rev. Dr. Ament boldly dashed into the palace and took possession. With the approval of the foreign authorities the property within was confiscated; "shop" was open; generals, members of the *corps diplomatique*, and those too conscientious to loot came to buy at moderate prices the looted goods; and the proceeds formed part of a fund to indemnify the native Christians. Several who hurried to buy the loot hurried away to "write the missionary up." To confiscate the property of those who were enemies in war may be theoretically wrong, but precedent establishes the right.

A somewhat similar mode of looting was that of entering houses other than those occupied, and taking the best that could be found. Old residents of Pekin not only knew where the wealth was, but generally distinguished between the Chinaman who was a friend and him who was a foe. For the former they sought protection; from the latter, loot. Personally, I regret that the guilty suffered so little at my own hands, though others, Chinese as well as foreigners, spared nothing when the attack once began. In fact, for the first four days, looting was all the fad. The troops of the different nationalities secured their rest through "change of occupation." To them the question was not so much, which Chinaman was the worst, but which house was the richest. There was hardly a house or shop that was not entered by some one. The Chinese sought immunity whenever possible; but even when looted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they made little complaint, being grateful that their lives were spared or their houses left standing. They expected that the whole city would suffer for the crime of its rulers. Their solidarity afforded no escape to the individual. Protection, when it came, was all the more appreciated.

As soon as the foreign powers decided on preserving Pekin, with the imperial palaces, the city was divided into sections for military control by the leading powers. The commanders of the contingents united in issuing orders which forbade all looting. To loot was then to plunder. As war passed into peace, and order began to prevail, the law became more than a formal utterance. It was finally enforced. The only looting permissible was that which military authorities directed. All the property of Boxers was officially confiscated. The Japanese, unmolested, captured over a million taels of silver from the Board of Revenue. The French captured nearly 200,000 taels from the palace of Prince Li, the head of the cabinet. These amounts, I understand, will be deducted from the full indemnity. What the Russians seized at the Summer Palace is unknown to outsiders. The Americans captured the imperial granary, and the Japanese another government granary. During the winter some of the rice thus secured was distributed among the poor Chinese.

The British commander, seeing the wild disorder produced by indiscriminate looting, and realizing the bad effects it would have on the discipline of the Indian troops, placed all looting under the command of officers. The supply was large. The loot godown and the loot auctions at the British legation furnished popular relaxation for those who had passed through the fatigue and perils of the march on Pekin; and the proceeds afforded a slight recompense to the officers and men who were the first to enter the Tartar city and relieve the beleaguered. It was all a part of the official direction of a memorable campaign against the Dowager and her satellites, who had dared to defy the world and insult mankind.

The looting inaugurated in Pekin was practised wherever foreign troops marched to punish and to occupy. The Germans and the French were especially active. Their zeal may, perhaps, be excessive according to American ideas, their treatment of the Chinese harsh, and their punishments devoid of equitable discrimination; but it should never be forgotten that prior to the victories of the allied forces the whole country was teeming with Boxers, that nearly every family was contributing to the support of the Boxers, and that every Christian desiring to live had to flee, to recant, or to combine with others for protection against Boxers and imperial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troops. The looting in connection with the occupation was mostly in the way of foraging for the support of the troops. Besides this, many fines were inflicted on different districts for the outrages previously committed.

Two causes of complaint have existed in connection with these punitive expeditions. First, the Chinese troops which were needed to help the authorities in maintaining order were driven outside the line of occupation, and no substantial authority with power to enforce was established in place of the native government. Secondly, these expeditions continued after negotiations of peace had begun; but the error here was that talk about peace began too soon. The looting was a minor consideration in the whole problem of carrying on war, when war had been declared by one side only.

The eccentricities of this unique campaign were emphasized by certain missionary exploits. The most noted participant was Rev. Dr. Ament, who, by the way, was as brave a man as the siege produced, a man of determined energy, broad sympathies, and self-sacrificing devotion. He and others have not been accused of looting during these country tours, but have been misunderstood for their efforts to indemnify the native Christians. When it became evident that the foreign ministers would not take into account the losses of Chinese converts, the missionaries boldly approached the local authorities, who, in turn, offered to indemnify those among their own people who had suffered through their adherence to the Christian faith. The missionaries made out a list of losses, so far as Americans were concerned, and asked for moderate compensation. In comparison with the indemnity to foreigners these amounts are a mere bagatelle. Looting, extortion, and blackmailing existed; but the charges cannot be laid at the door of American or English missionaries.

The first place for looting has generally been given to Pekin, but Tientsin is perhaps more entitled to the honor. Pekin is prominent because the great men have been here. The number of one's friends is now proportioned to the amount and value of one's loot. As America has resisted war, and as her troops came merely to relieve the legations — alas, for the Americans in Pekin if there had been no legations! — strict ethics should require that no American be found with loot. For those who have known the facts and have passed through a war of awful memory, the matter of loot is only one of high ethics.

GILBERT REID.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE LIBERAL PARTY: A MENACE TO ENGLISH DEMOCRACY.

If party and fundamental party principles were one and the same thing, such a sinister suggestion as that of the title of this article would be puerile. Or, if the ordinary man would take the trouble to discriminate between the two, democracy could afford to disregard it.

What need to recapitulate the splendid services which Liberalism has rendered to democracy? What need to contrast them with the hostility of Conservatism? And yet, strange as it may sound in some ears, it is necessary to affirm and re-affirm the fact that to-day the open hostility of Conservatism is not worth considering when compared with the insidious danger that threatens democracy in the attitude of that party — the Liberal party — which used to be its valiant vanguard and its watchful rear.

Let us once more set forth the fundamental principles, the aims, and the policy which have in the past attracted and held men, more or less completely, to one or other of the great English political parties. Let us give some account of them which would be likely to be accepted as impartial by the parties themselves. They have their roots deep down in the history of the English people; but it is not necessary to the present purpose to trace their evolution.

The modern Conservatives are the immediate and natural successors of the Tories of the Revolution period. They have always been enthusiastically loyal to the Crown and to all that the Crown stands for: the aristocratic and exclusive as opposed to the democratic and popular; the privileges of the few as opposed to the demands of the many. For, unlike their predecessors, the Tories, they have been spared the problem of a king *de jure* and a king *de facto*. They are, in short, the modern remnant of feudalism, though even they themselves could not but admit that, in these latter days, they represent only one-half of the great feudal idea; they have retained its emoluments while ignoring the duties which feudalism used to impose. Policy has been the consistent and logical outcome of principle. Conservatives as a party have denounced as dan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gerous, and have opposed, every demand for extension of the power of the common people, whether it has related to the franchise, to popular education, or to protection from the privileges of the land-owner or the capitalist. When the Protestant Succession became firmly established, they abjured Roman Catholicism, and have ever since warmly supported that compromise, the High Ritualistic State Church. Above all, broadly speaking, the Conservative party has been the war party. War suits its interests and its policy. War gives employment and promotion to the younger sons of the idle classes; war and conquest are supposed to open up new markets for big commercial undertakings; war draws the eyes of the nation to distant parts of the earth, and postpones popular demands for reform at home. When the nation is at war it is easy to persuade it that national honor and national existence depend on a strenuous maintenance and extension of international rights, rather than on a strenuous maintenance and extension of national and popular rights.

The modern Liberals have been worthy successors of the Whigs, who finally repudiated the doctrine of the divine right of kings. They accepted, and have over and over again tacitly affirmed, the great Whig principle that in England monarchy is a contract between king and people, and that the right of the king to reign continues so long only as he keeps his half of the contract. Practically, the Liberal party has included within itself the whole body of religious Nonconformity, which has stood for religious freedom, with its inevitable consequences, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Almost every extension of the franchise, of popular education, of the rights of the people as against the claims of the land-owner, the capitalist, and the monopolist has been carried by Liberal governments, or else wrested by Liberal oppositions from Conservative governments. The thing that is here put last is the thing which the Liberal party of a past day used to put first among the three great vital and primary necessaries of life, the life of Liberalism — peace.

It probably would be possible to show, however, as a matter of actual history, that the Liberal party has been involved in war to as large an extent as the Conservative party. But there would be a fallacy in such a demonstration. In order to prove this, it will be necessary to consider briefly some facts and figures bearing on the history of the two parties. Party government, as we now understand it, came in at the time of the Revolution. It was a natural consequence of the gradual formation within the Privy Council of the "Cabinet," that dominating factor in modern English politics. The whole subject forms a most in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teresting study in political evolution. But in the 200 years of the history of party government nothing is more remarkable than the game of see-saw which the two great parties have played. The extreme limit of duration of a Parliament is fixed by statute at seven years, but the actual average is very much shorter. During the last century, which well covers the period of activity of the modern parties, there were thirty-two distinct administrations: sixteen Liberal, fifteen Conservative, and one Conservative-Unionist. In the matter of duration, the Conservatives have had the advantage. They have held the reins of government rather longer than fifty-five years, as against the forty-four years of the Liberals; and, also, their longest period of power was twenty years (1807 to 1827) as against the Liberal seven years (1859 to 1866). Of the whole thirty-two administrations nine did not remain in existence for a complete year, and the average for one hundred years works out at three years and a little over forty-five days. It is very easy to understand that the policy, especially the foreign policy, of an incoming administration must be largely influenced and determined by that of its predecessor. And if these figures are kept in mind, it is also easy to see that, while human nature is what it is, the party of peace must be largely at the mercy of the party of war. It is notoriously easier to make war than to make peace, easier to arouse national and racial animosities and jealousies than to allay them; and a broad and just consideration of the history of the parties shows that again and again Liberal ministries have come into office trammelled and hampered by foreign and international complications and quarrels, the legacies of a preceding Tory or Conservative government.

Surely no one can deny that the limits, the dividing lines, between the two sets of ideas have been sharp and keen; and so long as the Conservative party meant Conservatism, and the Liberal party Liberalism, democracy was safe. It must be confessed, however, that there have been times when having eyes it saw not, and having ears it heard not. But to any one who has stood outside the clash of political life in England during the last few years, it must have been obvious that certain changes have been going on, silently and subtly for the most part, but with occasional manifest outbreaks. And to-day it would appear that the Liberal party and the Conservative party are for practical purposes almost identical; that fundamental differences in principles no longer govern action; and the completeness of the fusion of policy is not more astonishing than its rapidity, so far at least as can be traced by outward observation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How has the change come about? It may be instructive to ask, first of all, whether the Conservative party has become permeated with Liberal principles, and has adopted the aims and policy of its opponents. The attempts of Liberalism to form and keep an atmosphere in which it has a chance to assert itself are well summed up in the old Liberal watchwords — Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform. Certainly, the English Conservative party stands acquitted before the world of having "dished the Whigs" to the extent of deliberately pursuing peace, retrenchment, and reform. It is none the less true, however, that Conservatism itself has progressed, intellectually at all events, since it succeeded Toryism. It has never wanted reform, but, nevertheless, it has had to accept it — not on principle, but sometimes as policy, and sometimes, more often, under protest. It must be admitted that the modern Conservative is a very different person from his prototypes, the Cavalier and the Tory.

But if the Conservative party has progressed, or, rather, has been driven or dragged along, what has the Liberal party been doing? As we have seen, it has forced reforms on the Conservatives, and they themselves have been unable to withstand altogether the "spirit of the age." No one knows better than the orthodox Conservative that Toryism, the divine right of privilege and exclusion, has gone forever. Conservatism is a different thing. Conservatism relies entirely on its own strength and its own self-interest to protect it as long as may be from the flood-tide of democracy; and, moreover, it probably has an uncomfortable suspicion, underlying all its arrogance, that after all the voice of the people may be the voice of God, or, at least, the voice of destiny. "What is Conservatism?" a local magnate was asked by a young American lady, and after a short pause the reply came, "Sticking by each other." This change of ground means much. Unless it can be shown that Liberalism has progressed in the same or a bigger ratio, and the Liberal party with it, it is reasonable to suppose, the above conclusion being accepted, that this in itself has tended to lessen the distance between the van of the one force and the rear of the other. Few people would be bold enough to assert that Liberalism has progressed during the last five years. But the very recent history of the Liberal party goes far to prove that political life is subject to the same great law which governs moral and physical life, and which is generally regarded as an axiom. It is impossible to remain stationary; progress offers one alternative only — retrogression.

But retrogression, even as an outward and visible sign, takes us back

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much farther than that. It began fifteen years ago, or appeared to do so, with the famous Chamberlain apostasy. It is no part of the present purpose to discuss that event, so far as it relates to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain himself. Without underestimating the importance of that aspect, it is true to say that the occasion bore a much larger significance. It was a test. The opportunity was seized by a large body of men within the Liberal ranks to draw back from a party which had been progressing too fast for them. The apostates were chiefly men who had been born Liberals, who had inherited the Liberal tradition in much the same way as they had inherited the name of their family. Men of this stamp are often the most faithful not only to party, but to principles, so long as party issues hang upon principles whose form is familiar and understood. But they fail when old principles change their form, and present themselves in new guises and in new lights. These men were all careful to explain that they were still Liberals, and in harmony with the policy of Mr. Gladstone in every particular except the one question of Home Rule for Ireland. Truly, principles and beliefs are slight things so long as they are not brought to big practical issues.

But the career of Liberal Unionists has proved how impossible it is for men to deny even one logical outcome of a great fundamental and root theory, and yet continue faithful to it. Is it not true that the Unionist party has drifted back and back to rank Conservatism? Is it to be distinguished except in name from the Conservative party? "Nobody wastes time nowadays in dwelling on the identity of Liberal-Unionism with Conservatism . . . the vaunted partition has of course disappeared long ago," remarked the "Liverpool Daily Post" just before the general election.

The next great crisis in the history of the Liberal party was the death of Mr. Gladstone. The effect of that event on the morale of his followers has been discussed from almost every point of view. The personal ascendency of Gladstone illustrated the mingled strength and weakness of human nature. Liberalism *was* Gladstone; the living principles were incarnated in that tremendous personality, that grand heroic figure. Democratic ideas were no longer dim abstractions, vague philosophic truths. Clothed with human reality, spiritualized by human pity and tenderness, illuminated by a clear and shining intellect, they had spoken to the hearts and consciences of men; they had been made manifest to the meanest intelligence; they had appealed to all that is most aspiring in human nature. They no longer pleaded for concessions; they demanded rights that had been usurped, and repaid with scorn in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tensified a hundredfold the scorn which had been poured out upon them. The tendency, in short, was to abandon the defensive and assume the offensive attitude. "No man is necessary." The old hackneyed phrase is a mere truism if by "man" is meant simply the material, visible, presence. But if life, soul, spirit is meant, it at once becomes an inane absurdity. Gladstone passed, and with him Liberalism, that is, a certain conception of lofty ideas which had done a marvellous work for England and for the world. It was buried with him, as some one mournfully said. But in the widest and truest sense Gladstone was necessary, is necessary; Gladstone is undying, and the great truths underlying Gladstonian Liberalism are undying, though ever changing with the changing ages of the world.

But the Liberal party of to-day does not grasp this; it is hide-bound by tradition. It looks back instead of forward. Liberals assure us that they have given up nothing; they hold to their old beliefs. Precisely: but that is merely a phase of Conservatism. There are fresh conceptions of human liberty and progress, but the Liberal party does not accept them; and meanwhile the age with its new and tremendous ideas is rushing past, leaving Liberalism itself stranded high and dry. The men who in the days to come will shake themselves free and help to found a great new National Democratic party must be daily finding their fetters, as nominal members of the Liberal party, more and more intolerable.

One of the most significant features of the present party is its inability to produce leaders. There is neither the inspiration of a great dominating personality to animate the mass, nor is there that great helpless, formless passion in the mass which has never yet failed to kindle heroism in some man capable of giving it expression and direction. A party which is compelled to choose its leaders! No movement that is possessed by great and vital truths ever need descend to the expedient of choosing a leader. The whole history of the progressive forces that have moved the world proves it. A party may formally ratify and acknowledge a leadership, but the real appointment is beyond the control of a party caucus. However strongly one may repudiate the divine right of kings and of privilege, one is compelled to subscribe to a doctrine of the divine right of leaders!

Mr. Gladstone's death and all that event involved, in the loosening of old bonds and the questioning of old beliefs and old policy, made it almost inevitable that a state of chaos should prevail, and that the work of the re-formation and reorganization of the paralyzed forces should be one which would require time and patience. It was unfortunate that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no strenuous appeal from outside should have come early to its aid, no question big enough to inspire the scattered groups with a common purpose. A great reaction to Conservatism had set in, aided more than ever before by the growing power of materialism. The old Toryism was bad enough when viewed from the intellectual standpoint. Ethically it towered high above its successor, inasmuch as it fought largely for an ideal. The ideal was a false one, the outcome of a sentiment which did violence to reason; but even false ideals are better than none. This view may be fairly held while one is bound to admit that history shows a long record of fiendish deeds done by men who were not bad, deeds which were the perfectly natural outcome of false ideals which prompted them. To reconcile the contradiction has been the standing problem of the moral philosopher.

But modern Conservatism, frankly fighting for itself, has dropped all pretence of idealism; it has no conception outside its own interests. It is inspired purely by the gospel of materialism; for it must be noted that it has adopted commercialism not only as its chief support, but also as its chief aim. It no longer scorns money-making, even when in the pursuit it has to descend to undisguised trading. Perhaps democracy might have had little cause to lament this, had commercialism simply changed sides: the removal of a growing element of weakness would have been no cause for regret. But, unfortunately, the same thing has helped to work the ruin of the Liberal party. It has caught the infection: it no longer sees its Holy Grail in the old work for the uplifting of the people; it has no time and no inclination for that. Its vision has become so distorted that it can see nothing less huge than an Empire—not an Empire which is great because of the greatness and grandeur of the peoples who are the Empire, but a materialistic Empire to be won and to be held by the sword. And, strange conjunction, it is a military Empire which is to be one vast shop, a sort of universal store. We are to be no longer a mere nation of shopkeepers, but an Empire of shopkeepers. It is foolish and it is wicked. The true work of the Liberal party is to-day, no less than it was in the past, the lifting of the people to higher and ever higher levels, physically, morally, and intellectually. It is doubtless true that much the greater part of the specific work it set out to do is done. It has achieved political freedom for the people of England; it has put the means of great — almost unbounded — power into the hands of the English democracy. And, having done this, its knights have taken sword and shield, and are following "strange fires," while their nation reels back into the beast.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The tragedy that is interwoven with the dying of one century and the dawning of another will probably be the memory which, in the future, will stand out from all other national memories in the mind of every British man and woman who has taken part in it either as actor or witness. Eighteen months ago a great opportunity presented itself, an opportunity that, if it had been seized by the Liberal party in Parliament and in the country, would have meant new birth, political salvation for the present, and an unbounded horizon for future greatness. Eighteen months ago the rank and file were waiting for the "leaders" to speak out, and denounce the threatened reversion to barbarism. Then, as the weeks went on, the idea grew that the Liberal leaders must be in the confidence of the government, that there must be facts to justify their silence, a silence which remained unbroken with one honorable exception, that of Mr. John Morley. But we know the story now. There *was* nothing to know, except what any man might learn who cared enough for the honor of his country and of humanity. And, as the months have gone on, guilt has been heaped on guilt.

Mr. Labouchere has told the world since, that the Colonial Secretary assured the Liberal leaders there would be no war in South Africa, as a timely display of force would cause the Boers to yield. But does that explanation of the silence of the Liberal party clear it from guilt? Is it not morally and politically as bad to press unjust demands and to coerce by threats of force as actually to employ force? These prophetic words from one of the silent voices were strangely predictive; they were spoken by Mr. Gladstone half a century ago:

"I, for my part, am of opinion that Britain will stand shorn of a chief part of her glory and pride if she shall be found to have separated herself, through the policy she pursues abroad, from the moral support which the general and fixed convictions of mankind afford — if the day shall come when she may continue to excite the wonder and fear of other nations, but in which she shall have no part in their affection and regard. Let it not be so. Let us recognize, and recognize with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong — the principles of brotherhood among nations, and of their sacred independence. When we are asking for the maintenance of the rights which belong to our fellow-subjects abroad, let us do as we would be done by, and let us pay that respect to a feeble state and to the infancy of free institutions which we should desire and should exact toward their maturity and strength."

Such sentiments are all very well when used in the way of harmless quotations. It would scarcely be safe to plagiarize them in a meeting of the Liberal party to-day, or, perhaps it would be fairer to say, of twelve months ago. If the private experiences of the few men and women who were brave enough to condemn the policy of the government in South Africa could be written, a strange light would be thrown on the conduct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of numberless individual members of the party of liberty, of peace, and of free speech. It would be difficult to prove that it was guilty of joining in the howls and stone-throwing which were the fashionable controversial weapons used to silence the peace advocates in public; but its private conduct was not conducive to a belief in its entire innocence. The Liberal party is not quite so bellicose to-day. Circumstances have treated it cruelly, and it now finds the South African war an uncomfortable subject of conversation. Let us hope that repentance will follow the chastening, and that it will repudiate Jingoism and all its ways!

But who can believe that the future of democracy rests with a party which stood by while a Conservative government made war upon a free people at the bidding of commercial exploiters, which has raised no protest at the barbarous conduct of that war, and which has concurred in the annexation of two free republics? And that is the least part of the affair. The Liberal party, to a very large extent, has gloried in the war, has spread the war spirit, has preached war from hundreds of Liberal platforms and in hundreds of Nonconformist pulpits. And it has persecuted the few who have been faithful, and who have dared to denounce war, the war spirit, and all that war stands for. Is it not a fact patent to thoughtful and observant Englishmen to-day that if this party had not betrayed the heritage of the great past, we should have been saved, not perhaps from war, but from the worst consequences of the war, the moral degradation into which we have fallen? It was the sacred duty of the Liberal party to come to the rescue of the unthinking mob, whose instincts and passions are strong, but whose brains are weak, and which is always ready to follow, but cannot walk alone.

Many an honest Liberal will doubt the fairness of all this; but let such an one consider how, in order to support a war which, in Mr. Chamberlain's biting phrase, "they do not approve, but dare not oppose," Liberals have had to deny more than one fundamental theory. History is repeating itself. Even non-Liberals are uttering much the same sort of talk as Liberals uttered fifteen years ago, — Liberals who are now the warmest supporters of Jingoism and of a Conservative government. "When this war is over and out of the way, Liberalism will have a chance; these are the days of temptation in the wilderness." The plea is a pathetic one. Great movements and great progressive parties have had to suffer all the despair and sense of defeat that are conveyed in the idea. But the Liberal party shows a strong inclination to linger in the wilderness of temptation, and even to bargain with the devil who is showing it all the kingdoms of the earth, and the glory of them; it does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seem to be in any particular hurry to tell this particular tempter to get behind it. Is it likely to come forth from the wilderness in triumph?

A review of the speeches of the candidates at the recent general election would be instructive. First of all, let the advice be noted which "The Times" gave to Unionists to refrain from opposing Liberal candidates who were in agreement with the government in its South African policy. Obviously nothing else mattered. A Liberal was harmless if only he would shout for war; he was just as useful as a Conservative — probably more so. About the same time, Mr. John Albert Bright, John Bright's son, declared that "the main differences of the Unionists with the Liberals are fast receding." We have often been told that there is no such thing as political gratitude. If there is not, it is difficult to say why the Liberal party polled such an enormous number of votes; the bigness of Lord Salisbury's majority, so far, at least, as is shown by the contested elections, having been proved to be largely due to one of the defects in our system of Parliamentary representation.

The general election was unique in its way. It differed in a marked degree from any of its immediate predecessors. A general election in England used to be a lively experience. What a tremendous programme the Liberal party used to draw up, and how the Conservatives used to sneer at its Utopianism! Party spirit ran high, and we were told what a mischievous thing it was. People who were strong Liberals or strong Conservatives were reproved by well-intentioned folks who are fond of quoting certain well-worn lines of Macaulay's, quite oblivious of the fact that they are a mild satire upon themselves. It is to be hoped that the conduct of the general election satisfied them. But the men who have honestly contended for the necessity of party — a responsible government, and an opposition which watches and criticises — will find in the election of 1900 some justification for their theories. No one has ever contended that party government was the ideal government, but simply that it was an effort of human nature to counteract a certain tendency to corruption, which unchecked political power brings with it.

Truly, the Britons were like brothers. It was quite a family affair. Plenty of squabbling about family matters, but all in the most brotherly way; no interference allowed from outsiders. If any one ventured to criticise the affairs of this family party, the members of it immediately dropped their fraternal differences and turned on the outsider. The great matter it had in hand was a big war in South Africa. Some thought the government had not managed the thing well, and had not crushed the Boers quickly enough; others defended the government; others, again,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blamed the generals, and said they had been too humane; some blamed this department, some blamed that department. But it was not a party matter. The candidates — Liberals, Conservatives, and Liberal-Unionists — made speeches and wrote letters either blaming or excusing the government, the War Office, and the generals; insisted on the "necessity" for annexation; and then, at the end of the address, letter, or speech, disposed, in a few careless sentences, of such trifles as the housing problem, the drink traffic, old-age pensions, etc., etc., regretting how impossible it was to pay any attention to them just then. And the regret of the Conservative or Liberal-Unionist candidate was just as deep as the regret of the Liberal candidate, so far as an ordinary person could judge.

Well, the general election was over some months ago, and practically one question has since then absorbed the attention of the new Parliament and of the country, the question of army reform. And the upshot of all the quarrels and recriminations about the war is this: we are threatened with conscription in the near future. More definite still, we are duly notified that conscription, compulsory military service, is within the area of practical politics, and will certainly be imposed within a given time unless certain changes take place, which, however, no one seems to expect to see.

The "Nineteenth Century and After" for April, 1901, had two short articles on "Our Last Effort for a Voluntary Army" from different points of view, the civil and the military. The civilian writer boldly describes Mr. Brodrick's scheme as the swan-song of the purely voluntary system. Some sentences from the article by the military contributor, Major-General Frank S. Russell, C.M.G., are worth reproducing and are to be commended to the attention of every British democrat who has at heart the uplifting of the people of his own land; who believes in national and international righteousness; who has a passionate conviction that war is the last and the worst enemy of democracy; and who has no desire to see liberty-loving England put herself under the heel of a military despotism like those of the continent. Major-General Russell said:

"We are not ready for it [compulsory service] yet, but that it will come and must come sooner or later in some shape or form there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt."

Then the writer goes on to express a fear that such a proposal might be defeated by being made a party cry, and remarks naïvely:

"As long as we have the present system of government by party, conscription or compulsion would form an invaluable party cry for the Radical party, although in all social matters compulsory powers, compulsory acquisition of land, compulsion in the many varied incidents of municipal and local government form the principal planks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their political platform. It is notoriously unwise to hazard a prophecy, but it would seem tolerably certain that, if any form of compulsory service for the army is ever to be proposed and carried with the practically unanimous assent of the nation, it must be initiated by a Radical government, who, in such cases of national emergency, can rely on the loyal support of a Unionist opposition. It is true that the present leader has joined with the ex-leader of the Liberal party within the last few days in denouncing any form of compulsion in most uncompromising terms, but we have seen changes of opinion before among all classes of politicians. Such a change as this would not be the most complete or remarkable on record."

In plain English, plainer even than that of the military politician, the position is this: The military authorities, backed by the united Jingoism of the Conservative and Liberal-Unionist parties, want conscription. Conscription, however, if proposed by them, would be received with the greatest suspicion, would be made the subject of searching controversy, and, finally, would raise such a storm of opposition in the country that it might be defeated. But, then, there is the Radical party. Get it to propose conscription — not such a very startling suggestion after what it has done, and what it has not done. It has the confidence of the middle and working classes. Conscription under its auspices would "go down."

If militarism be one of the ideals of democracy; if the people of England should be content to remain, and to become, more completely than even they have been in the past the tools of a group of political gamesters, to be used by their masters for the purpose of crushing the democracies of "rival" nations; if they should not be capable of seeing that these other democracies and not kings, emperors, and big capitalists are their natural allies, let them be prepared to follow the present Liberal party. For, quite apart from the important circumstance that Lord Rosebery, who is certainly the ex-leader, and may again be the leader, has already declared for some form of conscription — though Major-General Russell appears to be either ignorant or incredulous of it — the recent conduct of the party generally has practically committed it to the support of the coming demand for conscription.

But, if it be indeed true that militarism is the last and worst enemy of democracy, let the various English democratic groups and societies unite in this one thing at least — let them beware how they put their trust in Neo-Liberalism. As well may democracy confide its future to a coalition of Conservatism and Liberal-Unionism, adorned with those strange hybrid blossoms of the political garden, the Tory-Democrat and the Liberal-Imperialist.

HATTIE E. MAHOOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## IS THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM ELECTIVE?

It is, perhaps, only natural, though it was scarcely to be expected, that the university which in the last year or two has most severely criticised the elective system is that which a quarter of a century ago deliberately advocated it, and in the face of almost universal opposition justified it in the eyes of American educators. There has evidently been a miscalculation. However, though Harvard has cautiously acknowledged its failure in the persons of no less authorities than Professor Münsterberg and Dean Briggs, the element of error has not yet been clearly stated, nor has the remedy been proposed. Many things have been said against the elective system, but they may all be summed up in one phrase: it is not elective. This is no specious paradox. It is the offer of free election that is specious.

No offer could seem fairer. The student is at liberty to choose as he will. He may specialize microscopically or scatter his attention over the universe; he may elect the most ancient subjects or the most modern, the hardest or the easiest. No offer, I repeat, could seem fairer. But experience disillusions. Some day or other a serious student wakes up to the fact that he is the victim of — shall we say a thimble-rigging game? For example, let us take the case of a serious specialist. Of all the world's knowledge the serious specialist values only one little plot. A multitude of courses is listed in the catalogue, fairly exhausting his field. Delightful! Clearly he can see which walnut-shell covers the pea. He chooses for his first year's study four courses — the very best possible selection, the only selection to open up his field. One moment: on closer scrutiny he finds that two of the four courses are given at the same hour, and that, therefore, he cannot take them in the same year. Still, there are at his command other courses, not so well adapted to his purposes, but sooner or later necessary. He chooses one. Hold again! On closer inspection he finds that appended to the course is a Roman numeral, and that the same numeral is against one of his other courses. After half an hour's search in the catalogue he finds that, though the two courses are given at different hours, and indeed on different days of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the week, the mid-year and final examinations in both take place on the same days. Obviously these two cannot be taken in the same year. With dampened spirits his eye lights on a second substitute. He could easily deny himself this course; but it is vastly interesting, if not important, and he has a year's work to arrange. Behold, this most interesting course was given last year, and will be given next year, but neither love nor money nor the void of a soul hungering for knowledge could induce the professor who gives it to deliver one sentence of one lecture. He is busy and more than busy with another course which will not be given next year. The specialist is at last forced to elect a course he does not really want. One entanglement as to hours of which the present deponent had knowledge forced a specialist in Elizabethan literature to elect — and, being a candidate for a degree with distinction, to get a high grade in — a course in the history of finance legislation in the United States. This was a tragic waste, for so many and so minute are the courses offered that the years at the student's disposal are all too few to cover even a comparatively narrow field. The specialist may well ruminate on the philosophy of Alice and her Wonderland jam. Yesterday he could elect anything, and to-morrow anything; but how empty is to-day!

Highly as the modern university regards the serious specialist, a more general sympathy will probably be given to the man who is seeking a liberal education. Such a man knows that in the four years at his disposal he cannot gain any real scientific knowledge even of the studies of the old-fashioned college curriculum. As taught now, at Harvard, they would occupy, according to President Eliot's report for 1894–5, twice four years. But by choosing a single group of closely related subjects, and taking honors in it, he hopes to master a considerable plot of the field of knowledge. I will not say that he chooses the ancient classics, for — though they are admirably taught in a general way in the great Oxford Honor School of Literæ Humaniores — the American student may be held to require, even in studying the classics, a larger element of scientific culture, which would take more time than is to be had. For the same reason I will not say that he chooses the modern languages and literatures, though such a choice might be defended. Let us say that he chooses a single modern language and literature—his own. Surely this is not too large a field for four years' study.

Of classics, mathematics, science, and history he has supposedly been given a working knowledge in the preparatory school. For the rest he relies on the elective system. Even in the beginning, like the special-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist, he is unable to choose the courses he most wants, because of the conflict of the hours of instruction and examination; and this difficulty pursues him year by year, increasing as the subjects to be taken grow fewer and fewer. But let us dismiss this as an incidental annoyance. His fate is foreshadowed when he finds that the multitude of courses by which alone he could cover the entire field of English literature would fill twice the time at his disposal. Already he has discovered that the elective system is not so very elective. He sadly omits Icelandic and Gothic and all but one of the courses in Anglo-Saxon. Some day he means to cover the ground by means of a history of literature and translations; but in point of fact, as the subjects are not at all necessary for his degree, and as he is overburdened with other work, he never does. He sticks to his last, and is the more willing to do so, because, being wise beyond the wont of undergraduates, he knows that it will be well to fortify his knowledge of the English language and literature with some knowledge of the history of the English people, and furthermore of the history and literature of the neighboring Germans and French.

Having scarcely time for a rapid survey of these complementary subjects, he elects only the introductory courses. In the aggregate they require many precious hours, and in order to take them he is obliged to omit outright the literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; but he knows that it is better to neglect a detail or two than the buttresses of the edifice he is building. Again he has miscalculated. After his complementary courses are begun, and it is too late to withdraw from them, he discovers even more clearly than the specialist how very unelective the elective system can be. It is the same old question of the thimble and the pea. The introductory courses are intended to introduce him to the study of history and of literature, not to complement his studies of English. He wanted to know in English history the social and the political movements, the vital and picturesque aspect of history; he is taught the sources and constitutions — the dry bones. He wanted to know in German and French the epochs of literature; he is taught the language, considered scientifically, or, at most, certain haphazard authors in whom he has only a superficial interest. If he is studying for honors he is obliged to waste enough time on these distracting courses to reach a high grade in each. The elective system is mighty, for he is a slave to it. This difficulty is typical. A student of history or of German who wants to study Elizabethan literature for its bearing on his subject is obliged to spend one full course — a quarter of a year's work — on the language of four or five plays of Shakspere before he is permitted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take a half course on Shakspere as a literary figure; and even then all the rest of the Elizabethan period is untouched.

Let us suppose that our student of English is wary as well as wise, preternaturally wary, and leaves all complementary subjects to private reading — for which he has no time. He is then able to devote himself to the three or four most important epochs in English literature. He has to leave out much that is of importance, so that he cannot hope to gain a synoptic view of the field as a whole; but of his few subjects he will at least be master. Here at last is the thimble that covers the pea. Not yet! In four courses out of five of those devoted to the greatest writers, the teacher's attention is directed primarily to a very special and scientific study of the language; the examination consists in explaining linguistic cruxes. Literary criticism, even of the most sober kind, is quite neglected. If the student learns what he is taught he may attain the highest grades and the highest honors without being able in the end to distinguish accurately the spirit of Chaucer from that of Elizabethan literature.

Furthermore, not every student is well advised enough to know precisely what course he requires that he may attain his end. In order, for example, to gain an understanding of the verse forms and even the spirit of Middle English and Elizabethan English, it is necessary to know the older French and Italian; but, as it happened, our student was not aware of the fact until he broke his shins against it, and it was nobody's business to tell him of it. And, even if he had been aware of it, he could not have taken those subjects without leaving great gaps in his English studies. He has graduated *summa cum laude* and with highest honors in English; but he has not even a correct outline knowledge of his subject. His education is a thing of shreds and patches.

Whatever may be the aim of the serious student, the elective system is similarly fatal to it. The signal merit of the old-fashioned curriculum was that its insistence on the classics and mathematics insured a mental culture and discipline of a very high order, and of a kind that is impossible where the student elects only purely scientific courses, or courses in which he happens to be especially interested. Let us suppose that the serious student wishes to elect his courses so as to receive this discipline. His plight is indicated in "Some Old-fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education" which have lately been divulged[1] by the Dean of Harvard College, Professor Le B. R. Briggs. The undergraduate "may choose the old studies but not the old instruction. In-

[1] "Atlantic Monthly," October, 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struction under an elective system is aimed at the specialist. In elective mathematics, for example, the non-mathematical student who takes the study for self-discipline finds the instruction too high for him; indeed, he finds no encouragement for electing mathematics at all." The same is true of the classics.

One kind of student, to be quite candid, profits vastly by the elective system, namely, the student whose artistic instinct makes him ambitious of gaining the maximum effect, an A. B., with the minimum expenditure of means. History D is a good course: the lectures do not come until eleven o'clock, and no thought of them blunts the edge of the evening before. Semitic C is another good course — only two lectures a week, and you can pass it with a few evenings of cramming. If such a man is fortunate enough to have learned foreign languages in the nursery or in travelling abroad, he elects all the general courses in French and German. This sort of man is regarded by Dean Briggs with unwonted impatience; but he has one great claim to our admiration. Of all possible kinds of students he alone has found the pea. For him the elective system is elective.

The men who developed the elective system, it is quite unnecessary to say, had no sinister intention. They were serious and scholarly teachers who revolted against the narrowness of the old curriculum, and to whom the nearest means of reform was suggested by the German plan. But the work of the elective system has been done, and the men who now uphold it are clogging the wheels of progress no less than those who fought it at the outset. The logic of circumstances has forced them to the theory that all knowledge is of equal importance, provided only that it is scientifically pursued. You may elect to study Shakspere and end by studying American finance legislation; but so long as you are compelled to study it scientifically, bless you, you are free.

The serenity of these men must of late have been somewhat clouded. Professor Hugo Münsterberg, as an editorial writer in "Scribner's Magazine" lately remarked, "has been explaining, gently but firmly, ostensibly to the teachers in secondary schools, but really to his colleagues in the Harvard faculty, that they are not imitating the German method successfully." In no way is the American college man in the same case as the German undergraduate. His preparatory schooling is likely to be three years in arrears, and, in any case, what he seeks is usually culture, not science. "The new notion of scholarship," this writer continues, "by which the degree means so much Latin and Greek, or the equivalent of them in botany or blacksmithing, finds no favor at all in what is sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed to be the native soil of the 'elective system.'" Dr. Münsterberg's own words, guarded as they are, are not without point: "Even in the college two-thirds of the elections are haphazard, controlled by accidental motives; election, of course, demands a wide view and broad knowledge of the whole field. . . . A helter-skelter chase of the unknown is no election." The writer in "Scribner's" concludes: "It is not desirable that a man should sell his birthright for a mess of pottage, even if he gets the pottage. If he does not get it, as Dr. Münsterberg intimates, of course his state is even worse."

Rough as the elective system is on the student who aspires to be merely a scholar, it is worse on the undergraduate who wants to train his mind and equip it for business and professional life. To him a purely scientific training is usually a positive detriment. Scrupulous exactitude and a sense of the elusiveness of all knowledge are an excellent and indispensable part of the bringing up of a scholar; but few things are better fitted, if pursued exclusively, to check the self-confidence of a normal man and blight his will. Poor Richard had a formula for the case: "A handsaw is a very good thing, but not to shave with." Before taking a vigorous hold on the affairs of Wall Street or of Washington, our recent graduates have first to get away from most of the standards that obtain in the university, or at least to supplement them by a host of others which they should have learned there. In another passage in the article already quoted Dean Briggs has touched the vital spot. He is speaking of the value to teachers of the peculiar fetich of Teutonized university instruction, the thesis, and of its liability to be of fictitious value. "Such theses, I suspect, have more than once been accepted for higher degrees; yet higher degrees won through them leave the winner farther from the best qualities of a teacher, remote from men and still more remote from boys. It was a relief the other day to hear a head-master say; 'I am looking for an under-teacher. I want first a man, and next a man to teach.'" What is true of teaching is even more obviously true of the great world of business and of politics. What it wants is men.

The cause of the break-down of the elective system, as at present constituted, is to be found in the machinery of instruction. The office of the teacher has become inextricably mixed up with a totally alien office — university discipline. Attendance at lectures is the only means of recording a student's presence in the university, and success in the examination in lecture courses is the only basis for judging of his diligence. At the tolling of a bell the student leaves all other affairs to report at a certain place. In the Middle Ages lectures were of necessity the main

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means of instruction. Books were rare and their prices prohibitive. The master read and the student copied. To-day there are 400,000 books in the Harvard library. Only in the higher courses are lectures necessary or profitable. But still instruction is carried on, even in the most general courses, by means of professorial lectures. Where great periods are covered by leaps and bounds, freshness or individuality of treatment is quite impossible. The tolling of the college bell dooms hundreds of students to hear a necessarily hurried and inarticulate statement of knowledge which has been carefully handled in printed form by the most brilliant writers, and to which a tutor might refer the student in a few minutes' conference. Modify the lecture system? It is the foundation of the police regulation. The boasted freedom of the elective system enables the student to choose in what courses he shall be made the unwilling ally of the administrative officer. The lectures waste the time of the student and exhaust the energy of the teacher; but unless the lecturers give them and the studious attend, how can the university know that the shiftless stay away?

It is necessary for the administrator to judge of the student's success as well as of his diligence. Twice every year the professors hold an examination lasting for three hours in each of their several courses. Of late years an ingenious means has been devised for making the examination an even more perfect ally of the police. In the middle of each term an examination of one hour is held to ensure that the student has not only attended lectures but studied outside; and, in order to expose the procrastinator, it has become the custom for the examination to be given without warning. Like the lecture system, the examination system throws the onus of discipline on the studious and the teachers. Two thousand students write yearly 32,000 examination books. Quite obviously the most advanced of the professors cannot spare time for the Herculean task of reading and duly grading their share of these books. They give over most of them to underpaid assistants. The logical result of such a system is that the examinations tend to be regarded merely as statements of fact, and the reading of the books merely as clerical labor. At much less expense and travail they might test thoroughly not only a student's knowledge, but his method and power. If academic distinctions are disprized in America, both in college and out of it, this is amply explained by the fact that they attest a student's diligence rather than his ability. They are awarded, like a Sunday-school prize, in return for a certain number of good-conduct checks.

It is not enough that the machinery of instruction wastes the time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the student and debases the office of the examiner; it is, as I have said, the cause of the break-down of the elective system. As long as each student is required to pursue every study under the eye of the disciplinarian, the decision as to what he shall study rests not with his desires or his needs, but with an elaborate schedule of lectures and examinations. So excessive are the evils of the present system that no less a man than Professor William James has advocated the abolition of the examinations.

This remedy is perhaps extreme; but the only alternative is almost as radical. It is to enable the student, at least the more serious student, to slip the trammels of the elective system, and instead to study rationally, and to be rationally examined in, the subject or group of subjects which he prefers. In a word, the courses of instruction should be organized into what the English call honor schools.

It may be objected that already it is possible to read for honors. The objection will scarcely convince any one who has ever taken the examination. It is oral, and occupies an hour or two. The men who conduct it are leading men in the department, and are often of world-wide reputation. They are so great that they understand the nature of the farce they are playing. No candidate is expected to have covered the field of his honor subject even in the broadest outlines. When the astute student is not sure of an answer, he candidly admits the fact and receives credit for knowing what he does not know — a cardinal virtue to the scientific mind. If I may be allowed a personal instance, I went up for the examination in English literature in complete ignorance as to all but a single brief movement. When my ignorances were laid bare, the examiners most considerately confined their questions to my period. We had much pleasant conversation. Each of the examiners had imparted in his courses his latest tid-bits of new light, and each in turn gave me the privilege of divulging these tid-bits to the others. For a brief but happy hour my importance was no less than that of the most eminent publication of the learned world. It need scarcely be said that such examinations are not supposed to have much weight in judging of the candidate's fitness. A more important test is a thesis studied from original sources, and the most important is good-conduct marks in a certain arbitrary number of set lecture courses. The policeman's examination is supreme.

If the chaos of the elective system is to be remedied, honors must be granted on some very different system. Perhaps the most useful example of what to emulate and what to avoid is to be found in the English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system of honor schools. While in the undivided American university the teaching and examining office remain identical, in England the college tutors lecture to, and consult with, their students, and the university board conducts the examination. Thus, when the field of learning expanded with the nineteenth century, the English university responded by adding, not a multiplicity of minute courses, but a series of well-conceived and well-ordered honor schools — Literæ Humaniores, Mathematics, History, Science, and the like. On the virtue of these honor schools there is not space to enlarge. I shall have to be content with saying that, by combining lecture courses with tutorial instruction and delegating the examining function to a university board, they insure precisely the freedom that is impossible under our elective system. As to their shortcomings I must be equally brief. Abetted by the power of endowed colleges, the tutors and tutorial lectures have stood in the way of advanced and university instruction; in the modern sense of the word Oxford is not properly a university. Clearly we should do ill if we adopted the defects of the English honor schools in the doubtful project of attaining their virtues. Any reform of our elective system must leave untouched the status of advanced scientific instruction, or, if possible, better it.

The problem is the most difficult and delicate one of striking a balance between tutorial and professorial instruction. Already there is a tendency in America to revert to personal teaching. In many of the larger courses it is impossible to obtain good results without conferences between teacher and taught. If the system of conferences could be extended the problem of the honor schools would be solved. It would be no longer necessary to rely on the lecture courses for police duty; and the wise guidance of a tutor would in some measure remove the necessity of the recurrent police examinations. Thus the student would be able to elect such courses only with the professors of the university as the competent adviser might judge it best for him to take; and if the faculty were relieved of the labor of unnecessary instruction and examination it would be possible, without greater expense than at present, to offer a well-considered honor examination, and to provide that the examination books should be graded with something more than clerical intelligence.

It would by no means be necessary to make the honor examination, as at Oxford, the only basis for granting the honor degree. The lecture courses found available by the student would be those in which the instruction is most advanced, the university courses, properly speaking; and his examinations in these would be a criterion—such as Oxford is very much in need of—for correcting the evidence of the honor exami-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation. Furthermore, in connection with one or more of these courses, it would be easy for the student to prepare an honor thesis studied from the original sources, under the constant advice of a university professor. Such a scheme might combine in any desired proportion the merits of the English honor schools with those of American advanced instruction.

As to the details of the new system experience would be the final teacher; but for a first experiment the English arrangement is in its main outline suggestive. An American pass degree, as distinguished from the more difficult honor degree, might be taken by electing, as all students now elect, a certain number of courses at random. For the increasing number of those who can afford three years' study only, such a degree would probably prove of the greatest advantage. For the honor men, two general examinations, such as the English "Moderations" and "Finals," would probably suffice. For his second-year honor examination, Moderations, a student might select from three or four general groups. This examination would offer just that opportunity for mental culture the lack of which Dean Briggs laments. Furthermore, it would be easy to arrange the second year's honor group so as to include such studies only as are serviceable both for the purposes of a general education and in leading to the studies the student is likely to elect for final honors. For the final examination the student might choose from a dozen or more honor groups, in any one of which he would receive scientific culture of the most advanced type; while by means of private reading under his tutor he might fill in very pleasantly the outlines of his subject.

It is probable that such a system would even facilitate the efforts of those who are endeavoring to transplant German standards. According to Professor Münsterberg, the student who specializes in the German university is a good two years or more in advance of the American freshman. The spirit of German instruction would thus require that the period of general culture be extended at least to the middle of the undergraduate course. Such a plan, and I fear such a plan only, would enable an undergraduate to choose what he wants and pursue it with a fair chance of success. It would make the elective system elective.

In his "Old-Fashioned Doubts," Dean Briggs has advocated a similar reform, though he apparently does not aim at quite as much freedom:

> "I still doubt whether we can do better for our children than, first, [in the preparatory school] to drill them in a few subjects, mostly old ones; then to give them a modest general education in college, or in all but the last year or two of college; then to let them specialize as energetically as they can, but not exclusively."

JOHN CORBIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

THE essential disadvantages of religious journalism are akin to those attributed to amphibious animals in the school-boy's definition, "creatures that can't live on the land and die in the water." It is not really at home either in the church or in the world. In ecclesiastical circles it is seldom that the editor of a religious paper is thought of as exerting an influence equal to that of the occupant of a leading pulpit, or that his work receives such sympathy and coöperation as are given to a missionary society. On the other hand, a journal of this type, though duly entered in a press directory, differs as widely from an average newspaper in its aims, its methods, and its limitations as a ministers' social union from a club of literary Bohemians. To his clerical brethren the editor of a church paper seems scarcely more than a layman, while secular journalists regard him as very much of an amateur. The fact is that his task demands a rare combination of spiritual fervor and professional skill. He must be in close touch with the most significant religious forces of his time, and must also possess a high development of the journalistic instinct. It has been said that if St. Paul returned to the world to-day, he would become the editor of a religious paper. If so, he would find ample scope for exercising the tact by which he "became all things to all men," and would soon have a new set of perils to add to those which he enumerated in writing to the Corinthians.

Just now there are indications of an awakening to the opportunity of religious journalism in America, together with a conviction that this opportunity will be missed unless there is a considerable modification of traditional methods. During a recent visit to England, Dr. A. E. Dunning, editor-in-chief of the Boston "Congregationalist," frankly told a representative of the London "Examiner" that the American religious journalism of even fifteen years ago was dead or dying. He described certain changes in the taste of readers which must be recognized by the religious newspaper "if it is to exist at all." In particular, he declared that, in his opinion, "the day of the strictly religious paper which excludes so-called 'secular' writing has almost ended." In view of the



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

near approach of this transition period, it may be of interest to institute a comparison with the religious journalism of England, which has got through its transitions in a series of small instalments, and now appears, on the whole, fairly stable and prosperous. In this article the word "journalism" will be interpreted as including periodical literature generally — quarterlies and monthlies as well as weeklies. The question of religious dailies, although none exists, would demand a separate article.

The problems and conditions of denominational journalism are nearly identical in the two countries. A periodical which is attached to one particular church has obviously a narrower field than any other kind of religious publication. Its possible constituency is necessarily smaller, and it has to depend for contributions mainly upon writers who are willing, from denominational loyalty, to accept less than the market rate of remuneration. It is certain to suffer from the growing tendency to make less of denominational distinctions, the tendency, as Henry Ward Beecher put it, to regard such differences as lines instead of walls. Its subscribers do not understand its limitations, and are consequently too exigent in their demands. They compare it, most unfairly, with the productions of wealthy publishing houses, which can afford to risk a large outlay, and are bound by no doctrinal or ecclesiastical restrictions. If it is official, its editor has to act under the instructions of a committee, which in its turn is controlled by a conference or other assembly: in such conditions it is hopeless to expect any vigor of initiative in its policy. If it is a private venture, it is exposed to the danger of creating or stimulating party feeling within the church, and thus loosening the very ties which it is intended to strengthen.

Yet the denominational periodical, whatever may be its future, has made in the past a valuable contribution to popular education. Long before the establishment of the great firms which have won a reputation for supplying cheap literature for the masses, there were many obscure villages in England — and doubtless many scattered townships in America — where the arrival of the itinerant preacher was eagerly awaited on account of the magazines in his saddle-bag scarcely less than for the sake of his own sermons. These publications, too, have not only given an intellectual stimulus to readers, but have also done good service in training writers. In many cases they have afforded opportunities of literary experience to contributors who have afterward won distinction beyond the boundaries of their own church.

In England, the denominational quarterlies that still exist are excellent in quality, but so few in number and so small in circulation and in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fluence that it needs an effort to remember them when one is thinking about religious journalism. The monthlies are more important, but are not very prominent in the public eye. They contain some of the best religious writing that is to be found anywhere, but it does not seem to reach very far. Writing for such publications affords something of the sensation of preaching in a half-empty church. There is reason to believe that purchasers allow their names to go on the subscription list rather to oblige the pastor or to benefit the church funds than from any hope of either edification or delight from the study of the magazine itself. The modern practice of cutting edges before publication has debarred the curious investigator from the use of one test which was formerly wont to yield discouraging revelations.

Of late years there have been evident indications of a growing tendency for denominational monthlies to be less distinctive than they used to be. You cannot put much Methodism or Presbyterianism into a description of the life history of the white ant, or an account of mountaineering in the Andes, or a criticism of the style of George Meredith, or an engraving of a picture in the Royal Academy. Still less can you express by these media the divergences between Wesleyan Methodism and Primitive Methodism. The success of the new policy is doubtful. The denominational magazine thus made undenominational wins no new subscribers from outside, for it cannot compete with the productions of the private publishing firms; at the same time it perplexes and disturbs its most attached readers within the church, who miss the features of denominational interest to which they have become accustomed. It is well to have a broad outlook; but the church organ which gives no indication of its affiliation except on the title-page has lost its *raison d'être.*

The English denominational weeklies, which are much more influential than the monthlies, are seldom officially connected with the churches they represent. One of the few exceptions is "The Presbyterian," which requires an annual subsidy of $1,250 from the Synod to keep it afloat. At every Methodist Ecumenical Conference the English delegates are surprised to find that the American Methodist weeklies are official, and the American delegates express equal astonishment at the absence of ecclesiastical control from the weeklies of English Methodism. The question will, no doubt, be discussed again next September, and each side will remain of its own opinion still. In spite of the fact that some of the most serious crises in the history of English Methodism have been connected with the freedom of independent newspapers, this freedom is considered to have been an advantage on the whole. It has certainly been of great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service in preparing the way for reforms which would not otherwise have been accomplished without strife.

It is scarcely necessary to say that all the weekly papers within the Anglican Church are unofficial. Of the many organs representing the various parties in that church, "The Guardian" has the most distinguished record. For years it excelled any of the professedly literary papers in its reviews of general literature. The recent announcement of a volume of articles collected from the contributions of Walter Pater to this journal gives some indication of its width of range. For its foreign news, "The Guardian" has not depended, like the other religious weeklies, upon the material provided by the daily press, but has maintained correspondents of its own in the European capitals. It was published at sixpence until a few years ago, when its price was reduced to threepence. Almost all the other religious weeklies in England, whether denominational or undenominational, are published at a penny. Owing to a disagreement with the proprietors respecting the ritual controversy, the editor of "The Guardian," Mr. Lathbury, recently resigned, and founded a paper of similar type, "The Pilot," at the old price of sixpence. Some of the penny papers within the Anglican Church have large circulations and considerable influence; but their topics are more exclusively ecclesiastical than those of the journals just named. Indeed, if current controversies were settled the occupation of some of them would be gone. The comments of Maurice, Robertson, and Kingsley on the Church of England journalism of their own day will be remembered in this connection.

It is when we turn to magazines and newspapers prepared for the religious public in general, and not for the adherents of a particular denomination, that a contrast is most evident between English and American methods. There does not appear to be anything on this side of the Atlantic corresponding to such sixpenny illustrated monthly magazines as "Good Words," "The Sunday Magazine," "The Sunday at Home," and "The Quiver." These periodicals are of long standing, and are widely read both by Established Churchmen and by Nonconformists. They avoid questions of ecclesiastical and doctrinal controversy, having been established to supply, for religious households, Sunday reading in harmony with the devotional spirit of the day. They do not abjure fiction or papers on science and travel, but they are entirely free from sensationalism, and breathe a restful, Sabbatic atmosphere. They number among their contributors some of the leading writers and artists. More varied in contents, but no less religious in tone, are such popular monthlies as "The Leisure Hour" and "The Young Man." It appears especially surprising

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the latter periodical, a vigorous threepenny magazine, has no counterpart in America.

There is another class of monthly religious magazines which has a large circulation, especially in the provinces. I refer to the penny and halfpenny periodicals, of which "The British Workman" and "The Cottager and Artisan" may be taken as types. They are widely distributed through the literature secretaries of Sunday-schools, and the engravings they publish may be seen adorning the walls of many a workingman's home in town and country. I use the word "adorning" advisedly, in spite of the contempt recently expressed by a New York editor for the taste of "the peasantry of the British Empire"; for, although they lay no claim to literary merit, these periodicals generally deserve high commendation for the quality of their printing and artistic production.

Near akin are the localized magazines, which are now a highly appreciated feature of church work in all parts of the kingdom. The localized magazine is an illustrated monthly publication of sixteen pages. Its London publisher supplies it in sheets four weeks in advance to individual churches, of whatever denomination, at the rate of about a dollar a hundred copies. The pastor or magazine agent of the church adds a wrapper, containing advertisements and church notices, printed locally. The complete magazine is then sold at a penny a copy, and the profits from advertisements and sales aid the funds of the church. It is often found practicable to sell a considerable number of copies, and then to distribute others as an announcement of the church's activities. The Carr's Lane Congregational Church, at Birmingham, of which Dr. R. W. Dale was pastor, takes no less than 4,000 copies a month of one of these magazines. The system is even more widely adopted in the Church of England than among Nonconformists. In small towns, three or four churches of various denominations often combine to issue a localized magazine, especially where a Free Church Council has been formed. Owing to the large circulation of the inside sheet, its publishers can afford to secure the help of leading writers. For instance, in taking up the programme of one of these magazines at random, I find an announcement of a serial story by Adeline Sergeant, and of contributions by Sir Walter Besant, "Ian Maclaren," Dr. R. F. Horton, Rev. F. B. Meyer, etc.

But the strongest and most influential section of religious journalism in England is undoubtedly that which consists of the independent and undenominational weeklies. Some of them have large circulations, pay their proprietors handsome profits, and do much to form the political as well as the religious opinions of their readers. Let us take, as a speci-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, "The Christian World." In general appearance it bears considerable resemblance to "The New York Times Saturday Review." Its columns are of the same width as those of the latter paper, but they are slightly longer, and there are five of them to a page instead of four. An average number consists of twenty-four pages. In the last number received up to the time of writing, I find over nine pages of advertisements. As these advertisements are paid for at rates varying from twelve cents a column-line to more than seven dollars a column-inch, according to position, it is evident that the proprietors need no subsidy, in spite of the cost of the literary matter. The paper includes Wednesday news from all parts of the country, including reference to Parliamentary debates on Wednesday nights; but it is delivered with the London daily papers of Thursday morning, and can be obtained during that day, for the sum of a penny, at almost every railway bookstall or news-agent's shop in the kingdom.

"The Christian World" contains a variety of articles on religious, social, and literary topics; but its most distinctive feature as compared with American religious papers is the completeness of its news of the events of the week in all the churches. To illustrate again from the current number, I find thirteen columns of news paragraphs from ten different denominations, in addition to Christian Endeavor, Y. M. C. A., and other undenominational organizations. There are also reports, varying from a column and a quarter to four columns, of the National Christian Endeavor Convention at Sheffield, the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist General Assembly at Aberystwyth, the "New Century" Unitarian Meetings in London, the Friends' Yearly Meeting, also in London, and the Annual Assemblies of the Established Church of Scotland and the United Free Church in Edinburgh. The prevailing tone of the paper is Congregationalist, but it is accepted without demur as representing the Free Churches generally. Its theology, however, is rather broader than that of the average Nonconformist minister or member. "The Christian World" was founded in 1857, and came in 1860 into the hands of the late Mr. James Clarke, who turned it from a struggling sheet into a successful paper. It has descended to his sons, who now control both the editorial and the publishing departments.

A younger religious paper, but one which has gained a strong position, is "The British Weekly," founded in 1886 by the coöperation of Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll and Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. This journal also gives full accounts of what is being done in all the churches; but its predominating flavor is Presbyterian. It publishes a special Scotch edition,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and has done much to introduce the leading Scotch preachers and theologians to the English public. It has made from the beginning a special feature of literary news and criticism, and can claim the credit of having "discovered," or at any rate of having encouraged early in their career, J. M. Barrie, "Ian Maclaren," Jane Barlow, and other well-known writers. One of its most attractive features is the admirable descriptive reporting by "Lorna," a Scotch lady journalist, who also edits the "Woman's World" column, writes brilliant interviews, and, there is reason to believe, acted as "The British Weekly's" military critic during the first few months of the Transvaal War. Another paper deserving special mention is "The Christian," which holds a place of its own as supplying the fullest record obtainable of the missionary and philanthropic activities, at home and abroad, of both the evangelical section of the Church of England and the Nonconformists.

Besides these there are several penny religious papers of a "Tit-Bits" type. In some cases they have a large circulation, but they carry no weight. Two or three of them have a certain connection with this country, inasmuch as they depend on American anecdotes and Dr. Talmage's sermons for a considerable proportion of their "copy." This outline of the undenominational religious press may conclude with a brief reference to such sectional papers as the organs of the Sunday-school, the Christian Endeavor movement, etc. In quality, influence, and circulation the American papers of this class are far ahead of those published in England. In particular, there is nothing in England to be set beside "The Sunday School Times" of Philadelphia.

A study of the history and tendencies of religious journalism suggests certain general reflections. In the first place, the religious paper, however its methods may be modified, is a permanent form of journalism; it is here to stay. The secular paper may pay increased attention to news of the churches; but, even though it should ultimately publish a weekly religious supplement — some day a newspaper proprietor will open his eyes and discover that there are as many people interested in religion as in literature — it can never make the definitely and aggressively religious organ unnecessary. For it is not a mere matter of news, but a question of tone and of standpoint. The problem cannot be solved by distributing a sufficient corps of smart reporters among a sufficient number of synods and conferences. As Dr. Dunning puts it in the interview previously mentioned: "The great interests of the church, ethical, sociological, educational, and missionary have become essential elements of national life." These cannot be understood except by men who have given them careful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study. There is further the difficulty of diversities of creeds. It is impossible for any one paper to meet the needs of even the leading denominations represented in this country. It might allot a certain space to each for its own ecclesiastical intelligence; but — however interesting a study so catholic a paper would be — it could not by any means present in one sheet even a discussion of the events of the day from the divergent standpoints of these various churches. Still less could it deal adequately with theological problems, or supply devotional reading that would be acceptable in all quarters. The necessary neutrality of a secular paper would involve insipidity also.

There is no reason, however, why there should not be a further grouping of literary effort among churches that are nearly allied. At any rate, the churches that in England are federated in the Free Church Council — the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Quakers — have enough in common to make such a union possible. The vast distances in this country will always prevent any Eastern weekly paper from circulating all over the United States to the same degree that a London paper circulates all over the United Kingdom. For that very reason it seems especially desirable that in various localities there should be arranged such combinations as I have just suggested. If at Chicago, for example, there were published one strong, well-endowed, and well-equipped religious weekly representing these various churches in the Middle West in the same way that "The Christian World" represents the Nonconformists of England, would it not exert a far stronger force in the promotion of righteousness than is at present exercised by all the religious papers of that city put together? It appears strange that while denominational differences are less acute in America than in England, as is shown by the facility with which a minister can travel from one church to another and then back again, a position of isolation should be so strongly cherished in literary enterprise. The recent advance of the Boston "Congregationalist" in publishing once a month a special number containing reports of the progress of other denominations is an encouraging sign of the times; but the admiring comment with which so hazardous an innovation has been received indicates the urgent need for it.

Another reason besides the tendency to interdenominational union will make it more and more difficult for a successful religious paper to be the official organ of any particular church. One of the most important functions of a journal of this kind is to lead the opinion of church members on such public questions as involve considerations of morality. But on several of the most urgent of these problems there is by no means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unanimity of sentiment within any particular church; and it is consequently impossible for any editor who is directly responsible to an ecclesiastical body, and whose paper is assisted by a subvention from that body, to be as outspoken and independent as the case demands. It is easy to enunciate general principles that everybody agrees with; but when it comes to their application the official editor is beset by a dilemma. The utmost he can say is, for instance, that if such-and-such a method of acquiring wealth is immoral, it ought to be condemned; whereas what the reader wants is some help in judging whether the hypothesis is a fact. No paper, whether religious or secular, can hold a position of permanent influence if its editor is always sitting on the fence.

The growing importance of these larger national questions will gradually overshadow interests of merely sectional or denominational significance. Hence there is a great future for such papers as "The Outlook" and "The Independent," which deal with big subjects from a religious point of view, and devote scarcely any space to the details of church work. But there seems to be room also for papers of "The Christian World" and "The British Weekly" type — papers, that is to say, which while discussing political and social problems and admitting lighter magazine features will also furnish an adequate chronicle of the more important events in the religious world. There are certain minutiæ which will tend to disappear, such as reports of bazaars, farewell presentations, church socials, and other items of no more than local value. Journalism has been defined as "the art of lending to people and events intrinsically dull an interest which does not properly belong to them"; but even an expert would be baffled by the task of adding a charm to some of the utterly insignificant paragraphs that pour in upon the desk of the editor of a church paper. There are movements and incidents, however, that repay full and careful treatment, and that cannot obtain the attention they deserve unless some religious journalist is willing to take pains about them.

Perhaps the most effective reform in the religious newspapers of the future will be a lowering in price. A paper of high quality appearing at the democratic figure of two cents would reach a large constituency that cannot afford the aristocratic ten cents, or even the reduced subscription price which has to be paid in one sum. By readers whose income is moderate two cents a week can be paid much more easily than a dollar a year. Accordingly, the paper which is to gain a large circulation among the multitude must be procurable at the railway book stall or at the news-agent's store as easily as through the mail. Supply

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and demand must stimulate each other until this stage has been reached. The importance of competent and enterprising business management is often overlooked in the discussion of this question; but it is as necessary to religious as to secular journalism. Where publisher and editor are alike efficient, the recommendations of readers will do more to extend the circulation than will be done by a lavish expenditure on advertising. The one thing that never induces people to subscribe to a religious paper is any attempt at coercion. If they like the paper they will buy it and read it, but they cannot be lectured into taking it.

To workers who need public applause to give a relish to their labors, and who cannot be content with any service which does not bring their own names into prominence and honor, religious journalism has few attractions to offer. After years of earnest effort, the religious editor, whatever place he may visit, will share the depressing experience of the editor of "The Eatanswill Independent" when he alighted wet and weary at Towcester. No enthusiastic crowds press forward to greet him; the church bells are silent; his very name elicits no responsive feeling in the torpid bosoms of the people. But, with all respect to Mr. Slurk, such a reception is not enough to curdle the ink in one's pen, if one's task is undertaken in a healthy spirit. It is true that a little encouragement now and then heartens and cheers; but the greatness of the work is itself a compensation for much that is disagreeable and depressing. When that is once understood, is it not as pleasant to labor in the shade as in the glare?

HERBERT W. HORWILL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## CERTAIN FAILURES IN SCHOOL HYGIENE.

It was my pleasant privilege to visit, quite recently, schools in nineteen towns, located in six States, spending in some cases several days or even weeks in observing a single school. I was received most courteously, even cordially, and both time and pains were taken to enable me to study the work. Under these circumstances I naturally hesitate to comment upon certain unfortunate features; and if I had not considered myself but a pedagogical tramp, picking up here and there whatever was found to be worth devouring, I should look upon myself in the light of a well-entertained guest who, at his departure, turns around and criticises his host. Disraeli declared it "more easy to be critical than correct." It is, perhaps, still easier to pick out the flaws in a well-regulated system; and, were it not for the fact that certain unhygienic incidents that I met with are probably typical, I should keep my silence.

The increasing importance attached to applied pedagogy and child-study, the sympathy and self-repression of the teacher, and the intense interest taken not only in the subjects taught but also in the pupils have been noticed with great pleasure. It is owing, perhaps, to these successful features in the schools of to-day that an outsider sees certain phases overlooked at times by those in charge.

As an illustration: In one of the most enviable school systems — in a city in New Jersey — it is the custom to eliminate the morning recess. The local school law on this matter states: "There shall be no out-door recess in any room above the second-year class." The following reasons were given for thus abolishing one of the most important features of school life, from both a hygienic and a social point of view: (1) When the children go out-doors they do not all put on their wraps, and so are apt to catch cold; (2) outdoor recess is unnecessary, as a five-minute recess is taken, during the morning session, in some of the rooms; (3) gymnastics take the place of the exercise the children would receive out-doors. Unfortunately gymnastics do take the place of the recesses. But of what do they consist? In the schools of the city under con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sideration I watched the gymnastic exercises in three buildings; but in none other of all the exercises in the schools did I see such close attention demanded, and needed, as in these gymnastics. In fact, the object of these non-voluntary exercises seemed to be the formation of habits of constant and close attention, immediate action, and rapidity of obedience. Many of the commands were given so rapidly as to strain the attention, lest the orders should be misunderstood and responded to by the wrong execution. This naturally causes an undue strain on nerves already fatigued by study. Afterward, as is often the case, the pupils were required to march and countermarch about the room until a sufficient amount of dust had been raised to enable them to take their singing lesson in comfort.

In two buildings I saw some very interesting bean-bag exercises. In one case the exercise was being tried in one of the large corridors, a most excellent plan; but the principal said, apologetically, that it was "an experiment." Unfortunately owing to lack of time and space some of the children were barred out of these exercises. It is also the custom in that city to prolong the morning session one hour on rainy days, and to omit the afternoon session. One of the teachers declared that this extra period was an agony both to pupils and teachers, and, as far as lessons were concerned, was absolutely useless.

On another occasion I visited several schools in another city, whose school system is of national, or even international, reputation. At one of these schools I was again told that the recess had been transferred to the close of the morning session. This may have accounted in part for the unusual amount of conversation indulged in by the pupils in one room, especially by those farthest away from the teacher, and also for the disorder in another room, where the open defiance shown to the teacher was the worst that I have ever seen in any school. In the second building I do not recall any recess; and in the third, where the order was much better, there was an intermission during which the pupils were lined up and then marched down to the basement. For this recess each room in turn was allowed five minutes.

It must be admitted that these are single instances. Yet is not the tendency to abolish the recess growing stronger among the teachers in this country? It was only a short time ago that a superintendent in one of the largest New England cities suggested in his annual report the abandonment of the afternoon recess. In school reports just received from two Southern cities, it is stated that the school sessions are from 9 A.M. to 2 P.M. In one city there is given on each school day a twenty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minutes' recess, and in the other, whose system has been granted a coveted exhibition diploma, fifteen minutes daily are allowed for "general recess or physical exercise." Unfortunately, the question of fatigue has not received so much attention in this country as in Germany. As a result, the American teacher, who is, of course, anxious to get out of the school-room as soon as possible, and also to avoid the "confusion" incident to recesses, is slowly bringing about the abandonment of intermissions; whereas in Germany there is a legal requirement demanding forty minutes of intermission, exclusive of gymnastics, for every five hours of school work.

The need of ventilation is one important reason for frequent recesses. Although the ventilating systems in use in most of the schools of to-day are considered, by their manufacturers, almost perfect, yet in many rooms visited the air was not pure, and the temperature was either too high or too low, generally too high. In some cases the temperature was so high and the fresh air so scanty that pupils fainted, and teachers admitted that they felt faint. It is an axiom of hygiene that a well-regulated nose and a well-clothed body are in health among the best testers of foul air and extreme temperature; and yet even these gauges, though always at hand, are neglected. But, however perfect the heating system may be, there is certainly an advantage in opening the windows, from time to time, for a minute or two, for the purpose of letting in fresh air and permitting the foul air to escape. It does not even need Dr. Dankwarth's experiments to corroborate this statement. The thermometer itself is an inaccurate indicator of the temperature of the school-room, when one thermometer only is used, and when that is hung not in the open, and at a level with the children's heads, but, as is generally the case, against the wall, at a place and a height where the children never are.

Again, even with the best heating apparatus the air is generally dry and dusty. Kotelmann, in his "School Hygiene," says:

> "If dust has settled on the heating surface of the furnace, or if dust-laden air comes in contact with it, the dust particles are scorched, and burnt products are produced which irritate the mucous membranes of the throat and eyes."

The child is exposed to this danger, not only from heating and overheating, and from dust raised by marching and stamping over the school-room floor, but also from the chalk-dust. In one school-room it was the practice of the teacher to have several pupils erase all the chalk marks from the board just before dismissal. These children certainly had something to take home from school in their little heads. I was recently in another room where each member of the class in algebra was sent to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

board to work out examples. As the space on the board was limited, the pupils were crowded, which, to be sure, gave them an advantage in copying their neighbor's examples; but it also had the disadvantage of enveloping them in clouds of dust, since, at the completion of each example, there was a simultaneous rapid erasure by the pupils at the board.

Probably no book on the general subject of school hygiene has been published from the days of Horace Mann to the present time that does not include at least a reference to the position of the pupil at his desk. Indeed, even Locke hinted at this when he wrote that the pupil "should learn how to lay his Paper, and place his Arm and Body to it." One of the blessings promised by those who introduced the vertical system of penmanship was a correction of the crooked-back position of the pupils, since they must sit correctly in order to write the script correctly. The vertical system, if properly used, does possess this merit as long as the child is engaged in the writing exercise; but its influence amounts to little beyond this. Although I visited scores of school-rooms of all grades, in country and city, yet, so far as I can recall, the position of the pupil while writing was apparently unnoticed by any teacher, at any time, in any room, except during the few minutes set apart for "penmanship." This is all the more painful when we consider that writing as a distinct exercise occupies only a few minutes each day, while one-fifth to one-half of the time spent by the pupil in the school building is occupied by written work. Indeed, the spelling of the motto of the school-room of to-day seems to have been slightly changed until it reads: "Always do write."

The undue amount of time given to this work may be more or less pedagogical; but it is most certainly unhygienic, for not only are the muscles of the trunk and arms involved in an incorrect position at the desk, for the greater part of the time, but the injury to the eyes from too close attention to the script and from the careful following of the pen and pencil points would seem to be incalculable. Incorrect posture insidiously tends to induce spinal curvature and diseases of the internal organs. Eulenberg has declared that 90 per cent of curvatures of the spine not caused by actual bone disease are developed during school life; and Cohn and other oculists have shown that the most serious cases of near-sightedness increase in direct proportion to the advance in school grades. Whether or not these views are correct, it is, nevertheless, of the utmost importance that these investigations should be considered.

I was unpleasantly surprised to notice a comparatively new evil in school hygiene, one that I am afraid has come to stay. I refer to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mimeograph, the hectograph, and kindred graphic devices, which, if improperly used, turn out copies which cannot fail to endanger the eyes. I have seldom seen a machine so perfectly manipulated in the school-room as to give a clear copy on every sheet handed out to the pupils. Quite recently I happened to be in a school-room where the teacher of geography was reading over the questions or syllabus she had prepared, because the hectograph copies she had distributed were too faint to be read.

Probably too little attention is given by the teacher to the general health of her pupils, and it is not surprising if she has not been taught to look for the evils that may arise. In a school-room in New Jersey I noted within a few minutes one child with some throat trouble, one with an eye disease, and a third with disease, apparently, in both throat and nose, possibly due to catarrh. There was no indication on the part of the teacher that she noticed these disabilities; and I was still further surprised when I learned, a few weeks later, that this same teacher had been appointed to the principalship of a new school just opened in the city. I have one delightful recollection of a teacher in a Vermont school who made one of her pupils who was slightly deaf change her seat so that she might more easily hear a story I was to tell.

I shall not ask "What is the cause that the former days were better than these?" for I admit that, all things considered, the present days are the better. I have a decided impression, however, that more training was formerly given to the voice of the child than is given to-day. Voice culture certainly holds but a small place in the curricula of the lower schools at the present time. This is evident from the thickness of speech, the careless enunciation, and the dropping of final letters, all resulting in a general indistinctness. This should be classed among hygienic evils; because, to a certain extent, the character of the phonation indicates the condition of the health of the vocal organs. The singing exercise may also be responsible for injured vocal organs, for in singing the condition of the individual voice is rarely taken into consideration. In one school — a model school, too — where the music to be sung by the children was refreshingly delightful in its beauty and artistic taste, the range of the selections to be learned was too great. I admit that the pupils were divided into two sections, since they were learning a two-part song; and yet, as is usually the case, they were divided not according to voices, but according to the arrangement of the seats. A still worse evil may be daily noticed in almost all high schools and upper-grade rooms where the pupils attempt to sing, often *fortis-*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*simo*, apparently without the teacher's knowing the important fact that the voice is a wonderfully delicate organ, when it is changing, and that at this time it can be most easily injured for life. Some throat specialists go so far as to say that a boy should never sing while his voice is changing. It may be true that ninety per cent of Americans are troubled with catarrh; but if this catarrhal tendency were checked in the child, and due regard were paid by the teacher to the voice and the voice-producing organs, the rate of this disease would probably be checked.

Is the teacher supposed to be also a physician? Certainly not; yet every teacher should have a sure and practical knowledge of many of the essential features of school hygiene, including both mental and physical pathology. At a recent meeting of the New York Academy of Medicine, Prof. Lightner Witmer, of the University of Pennsylvania, declared that the teacher was more favorably situated than the physician for detecting mental deficiency. That Prof. Witmer closely associated mental with physical deficiency was shown by his statement that he had never met with a case of chronic bad spelling in which he had not also found some visual defect. The knowledge on the part of the teacher, in this regard, need be no more than is necessary to enable her to detect, by simple tests where necessary, defects in seeing, hearing, talking, dentition, posture, and general health. When actual defects are discovered, the parents should be consulted, and the necessity of a physician's attention should be shown to them. Is it unfair to expect the teacher to have this training when she is supposed to have the general oversight of the child? And if the teacher is lacking in a knowledge of the elements of school hygiene, should we not place a part of the blame on the institutions that train her?

I recently spent a month in foraging around in a well-known New England normal school. While there, I neither heard nor heard of any instruction given on school hygiene. Moreover, in the model school there was no artificial ventilation, and some of the rooms were heated, generally overheated, by means of unjacketed stoves. The vivacious, energetic critic teacher, who confessed to me that she almost fell asleep in one of the rooms, mentioned the matter of overheating to one of her classes — the only recollection I have of any mention by her or any one else in the school on the subject of school hygiene. In addition to these and other hygienic evils at this model school, the closets were in a filthy condition, and there was no indication that they had ever been disinfected.

Although woman naturally represents the conservative side of humanity, yet the professionally trained teacher is generally willing and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eager to be progressive in any line that she considers will be for her advantage and for that of her pupils. It is not to be wondered at that, with her multiplicity of duties, the teacher should fail to notice that her pupils have not removed their rubbers, laying the foundation for corns and chilblains in plenty; that some of the books the children are using are filthy, and never were, and never will be, disinfected; that, while she is trying to explain a problem in arithmetic the little backs and shoulders and arms of her pupils are unnaturally twisted and bent; and that a dozen other facts are working to the perpetual discomfort, if not actual detriment, of those for whom she is responsible. I have not spoken of the teacher's recognized enemy, the janitor, the autocrat of the school-house, the man who neglects his work, and who holds his position because he has a vote — sometimes flexible — and a political pull, the man who, with a broom, and a duster, most aptly named, sends the microbes sailing once more.

In the catalogues of fifty normal schools, in twenty-nine States, there is not to be found a single indication of a distinct course in school hygiene, although in one catalogue it is said that "the greater part of the time [of a course in school management] will be devoted to the subject of school hygiene in its relation to the different phases of school management." Also in one other school it is fortunately included "for the shaping of the school conformably to the laws of the child's physical nature." In a third school "school hygiene" is mentioned as the last division, and, judging from the full outline of "physiology and hygiene," one of the least important. And in two other schools of these fifty the subject is mentioned to the extent that in each case a book on the subject is expected to be read. There are perhaps schools where the subject exists by itself, and probably among these fifty it is taught in connection with "physiology and hygiene," or it may be hidden away under "school management."

School hygiene is now recognized as a subject by itself: and thanks to Dr. Burnham, of Clark University, and other scientists, the public is becoming interested in it, and the normal schools are beginning to give it the place it demands. The fifty normal schools referred to were selected at random, and a few of the catalogues were a year old. I know of two schools not included in the fifty which have recently admitted the subject to their curricula; and were I permitted to lapse into prophecy, I should declare that ten years from now the professionally-trained teacher who is not acquainted with the principles of this subject will not be considered worthy of recognition. R. CLARK.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A PLEA FOR ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES.

THE century which has recently closed was preëminent for its marvellous widening of man's intellectual horizons and for its summoning of the multitude to share in this beneficent enlargement of the human outlook. The summits of learning are no longer walled about by insurmountable barriers; and even those who cannot scale these loftier peaks may yet climb the lower heights and look out upon a wider and fairer world than spreads itself to their view from below. The multiplication of books has made them the possession of the many: and to minds gifted with imagination the printed page reveals a new world almost as actual as that in which our outer lives are passed. While to the traveller history and art become familiar and vital in the material presence of the monuments of other days, to the stay-at-home the text-book of history can make the past live again, while the photograph and lantern-slide bring to his eyes the storied relics of antiquity and the artistic treasures of other continents.

It is by no mere chance that the fine arts have come to share in this popular intellectual awakening. Our people are not devoid of artistic impulses; but until lately they have been too absorbed in their vast industrial activities and the solution of the grave political and social problems of their destiny to give much thought to the finer amenities of life. Only in recent years have they begun to discover the extent of their artistic destitution and to realize the immaturity of many features of the national life. This consciousness, once awakened, has aroused a new interest in artistic and historical studies. It is the thirsty who travel far to seek the fountain. Yet with all the progress of the last quarter of a century, it is surprising to note how often people of fair education think of art as a wholly extraneous thing, having about as much to do with every-day life and its concerns as esoteric Buddhism or the theology of the Greek poets. It may be for them an entertaining and perhaps profitable study, but it is still an outside concern which it is quite permissible to ignore.

People who entertain such ideas as these have had for the most part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no opportunity to learn what art really is. They have seldom seen a beautiful building, or looked upon a fine picture, or stood before a noble statue. Their lives and surroundings have been barren of beauty. Through lack of occasion for exercise, and by reason of mental preoccupation with practical, social, religious, political, and other interests, their æsthetic sensibilities have become atrophied. These lie dormant, but they can be awakened. Give sufficient contact and communion with beautiful things, and these æsthetic capacities spring into life like flowers in the sun. At their first emergence they are crude and undeveloped, like all new-born things. They need for their growth the enlightenment of correct information and the stimulus of acquaintance with the masterpieces.

Correct information is easily supplied: manuals treating of the history and general principles of the arts were never so abundant and cheap as to-day. Acquaintance with the masterpieces is also possible to some extent for every one, not, it is true, that intimate acquaintance which comes only from long and familiar communion with the great works themselves, but acquaintance, nevertheless, of a valuable and inspiring sort, through the medium of photographs, casts, engravings, and that nineteenth-century miracle the stereopticon, which places before the eye in vivid relief the luminous image of the object, in an aspect only less real than the reality itself. And the acquisition of such information is not only demanded by those whose ignorance of art is profound and whose tastes are unawakened. The large and ever-growing ranks of those who have already mastered the rudiments, at least, of the knowledge of art in general, or of particular phases of the arts, call for further draughts at the fountain from which they have already drunk so refreshingly. For those whose minds are alert and whose artistic enthusiasm has already been kindled, these multiplied sources of information are even more profitable than for those to whom only the first pages of the history and principles of art have as yet been opened.

The training of the taste thus awakened is a less simple thing than its awakening. Good taste cannot be imparted like a science; for taste is not a matter of formulæ, and the principles of art elude definition and rigid statement. Facts, however, can be stated with precision; and the facts of the history of art, and especially of architecture, are not only full of interest, but also full of instruction. Moreover, the history of architecture, as of art in general, has to do not only with facts, but also with the relations between them. These relations are, in a measure, matters of personal opinion, of speculation, or of inference. They are,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for this reason, amenable to the test of the reader's own judgment. The facts he must, perforce, take on trust; but the inferences and conclusions from them he is free, and often perfectly competent, to weigh in the balance of his own reasoning.

In the case of the history of architecture, these facts derive additional importance from their connection with, and bearing upon, the great movements of life and thought which preceded and accompanied them. The study of the chronicles of building in any period must involve also the study of the political movements and social conditions of the times under review, or it will fail utterly of its purpose. The history, I had almost said the biography, of every great architectural masterpiece is, as it were, saturated with the aroma of historical and romantic associations. Indeed, there can hardly be a more delightful way of studying the history of civilization than to make it centre about the development and progress of the art of building.

The reader is free, as I have said, to pass his own judgments upon the inferences and conclusions which an author draws from the facts he presents. He is no less free to pass under review the criticisms which he encounters in his reading. There is no absolute standard by which to measure artistic merit. Æsthetic criticism must necessarily be subjective and personal. There are, of course, certain verdicts which the ages have registered, and which even the most daring critic can hardly call in question. Apart from these the critic's own judgments are simply the records of impressions received from his personal study of the works under discussion, or the conclusions he has drawn from comparisons of various works one with another. Whatever he says is subject to review by the appellate court of the reader's own intellect; and by offering a stimulus to the exercise of this arbitrament the critic renders to the reader a genuine intellectual service.

The value of criticisms of art lies not so much in the verdicts they pronounce as in the mental processes which they incite. Suggestive criticism is the only valuable criticism; but even the arbitrary *ex cathedrâ* declarations of the most self-conscious authority may contain fruitful suggestions, and prove a means of grace to the lay reader. The self-assertiveness of Ruskin's critical writing is as notorious as the erroneousness of many of his particular judgments; but the stimulating effect of his outgivings as a whole upon the English people can hardly be overestimated.

What has just been said of the fine arts in general is especially and emphatically true of architecture. This is the greatest of the arts, and the one which touches human life most intimately and at the most points.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It houses us and our business and our worship; its works are around us on every hand; we cannot get away from it. We can get along without pictures and without statues, but we cannot get along without buildings; and buildings become works of architecture the moment they become the objects of the desire to produce what is beautiful. The highest aspirations and the loftiest sentiments have often found in works of architecture their fullest and noblest expression, and buildings have always played a large part in the history of great movements. None other of the arts makes so wide and so general an appeal to the intellect as architecture, which is both a useful art and a fine art. The splendor of its masterpieces appeals even to the uncultivated taste, and their grandeur often stirs the most impassive nature. The higher qualities of the art — refinement, restraint, just proportions, delicacy of detail — call forth the admiration of a less numerous, but more highly educated, public.

The industry of building is, next to that of agriculture, the greatest of all industries, and directly or indirectly gives employment to a notable fraction of the whole population. An important part of our mining and metallurgical activities; the quarrying and transportation of building stone; the manufacture of brick and terra-cotta; the trades of the carpenter, mason, plumber, glazier, painter, and cabinet-maker; the professions of sanitary and civil engineering, with the trades allied to them; the vast lumber interests of the country, and a host of minor activities — all these are maintained in the service of architecture. Together they employ or support millions of men, women, and children. These are all ancillary to the actual work of designing and erecting, of buying and selling, buildings — lines of business in themselves of great importance. An art having so wide an outreach may well be a subject of interest to large numbers outside the ranks of those who are directly concerned in its practice.

The operations of building, moreover, are not carried on out of sight, in studios and workshops. They are conspicuously public, and arrest the attention of every passer-by. One does not need to be learned in engineering to take an intelligent interest in these operations. There is something fascinating in the gradual progress of a building from its deep foundations to its capstone. Out of confusion, dirt, piles of coarse materials, dust, mortar, timber, gray iron beams, brick, and stone, a crowd of busy men, seemingly undisciplined and without any visible commander, little by little bring order, form, and, eventually, beauty. Soiled sheets of tracing-linen and wrinkled and bespattered blue-prints, covered over with a maze of lines and figures, control this chaotic activity and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bring the diverse labors of a score of trades into mutual fitness and harmony.

These diagrams, though hieroglyphics to the uninitiated, are the graphic records of a conception matured and worked out in the mind of the architect. The whole edifice, down to its smallest details, with all its multiplicity of fixtures, devices, pipes, wires, and flues, in all the complexity of its constructive parts of brick, stone, steel, wood, and glass, has been thought out and erected in the mind and imagination of its designer. All this stirring activity of men and machines, this bringing together — from different shops, from different cities, and even from different States and foreign lands — of the constituent elements of the fabric is but the concrete realization of processes which have already been completed in the thought of the architect. There is something marvellous in this organization of forces for the translation of a thought into tangible form. The wonder is great to the spectator to whom not a single step of the complex process is clearly intelligible. Nor does this wonder diminish with increased knowledge; for the more one learns of the "how" and the "why" of these great correlations of thought and action, the better can one grasp their wide and deep significance.

Back of all these operations lies the design which they are intended to reproduce. Behind and above the contractor stands the architect. The form and aspect of the edifice slowly taking shape before the eyes of the public are his creation. The completed design is the product of his reason and imagination working upon a definite problem, some of whose conditions have been imposed upon him by his client's requirements, and others by circumstances and forces beyond the control of either. So far as it has free scope, the taste of the architect determines the artistic quality of the result. A man of strong personality may rise superior to influences which would gravely hamper another of less independence. In general, however — always, in the long run — the average level of artistic excellence in the buildings of any given community is determined by the average artistic culture of its population. Individual buildings may stand far above this level of excellence, but others as far below it will bring down the average to the level of the local taste. In time, every town, village, and city gets just about the sort of architecture it really wants.

This is, after all, only one way of saying that the architecture of any place and age is the natural product and expression of the culture and civilization of that time and place. This is the great and significant fact which gives to the history of architecture its vital interest. Every great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

building, every great class of buildings, stands for definite historic causes and forces. The magnificent cathedrals of the Middle Ages are no more conceivable as the products of our own day and generation than is a modern twenty-story office building imaginable in ancient Thebes or Memphis. The forces and movements which have produced the great monuments of architecture constitute a study of the deepest interest. To one who has learned something of how the builder's art responds to the changes which take place in human thought and culture, reflecting in its transformations of style the onward progress or the retrogression of civilization, the great buildings of the world are more eloquent than the pages of the most gifted historian.

The history of architecture is, indeed, simply one department of the history of civilization; but it is a branch of the general subject whose importance educators are only beginning to realize. The directness of the influence upon architecture of movements in themselves purely religious, social, or political is appreciated by very few. Only those who have made it a subject of special study realize how wonderfully the historic styles of architecture interpret the history — not the art-history merely, but the general historic march of events, social, political, religious, commercial, intellectual — of the times to which they belong. All the great ethnic movements, the colonizations, migrations, incursions and conquests of history, have left their mark on architecture. By their buildings we can follow the triumphant march of the Arabs and Moors in the seventh and eighth centuries along the shores of the Mediterranean. Changes in the theology and rubrics of Christendom are written into the varying plans of the churches of early and mediæval Europe. The revolution in the methods and content of human thought which we call the Renaissance brought about a revolution no less complete in architectural art; and one may trace the exact course and progress of this intellectual revolution through Europe by the style of the buildings which arose along its path. The differences of temperament and character between the Greeks and Romans of antiquity are as clearly readable in the aspect of the monuments they have respectively left to the world as in the pages of their poets, philosophers, and historians.

Such examples might be indefinitely multiplied; but these suffice to illustrate the closeness of the relation between the history of architecture and the general history of civilization. This gives to the study of architectural history an interest far transcending that which belongs to it merely as a branch of the history of art. To many, it is true, it suggests nothing but a dry record of the sequence and changes of styles,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the substitution of one set of decorative forms for another — which sufficiently explains its failure to receive the recognition it deserves. For this too common misapprehension the writers of architectural histories are in part to blame. They have too often themselves taken the narrow view, and, writing chiefly for professional students, who may be supposed to be interested in the technical details of the styles, have failed to treat of the larger aspects of their subject. There is no question that it can be made as dry as the driest of abstractions; but when it is properly handled it becomes a study of wonderful breadth and suggestiveness.

Another obstacle to the growth of popular interest in the history of architecture is the impression that it bristles with technicalities. For this, again, the writers, or at least some writers, of architectural books are to blame, and for the reason already given above, namely, that they have written too exclusively for technical students, and not enough for the general public. As a matter of fact, the technicalities of architecture are not necessarily formidable. There are certain frequently recurring terms whose meaning the reader needs to have explained and to bear in mind; but their number is not great, and it is possible to treat of the historic progress of the art with very little recourse to others than these few and common terms. It is by no means necessary to discuss in detail the scientific and more abstrusely technical phases of architecture, in order to get a clear idea of its history and development. Gothic vaulting, for instance, may be handled on its static and constructive side in such a way as to frighten any reader but a civil engineer, or it may be discussed in simple and lucid language in such a manner as to attract, and hold the attention of, the non-professional reader.

There is a great deal to interest the amateur and layman even in the structural developments of the various forms of building which have prevailed in different periods and countries. There is nothing mysterious or abstruse in the fundamental principles of construction. A child's building-blocks will suffice to illustrate most of those which it is essential for the amateur to understand. The remainder can be elucidated by means almost as simple. All that the ordinary reader requires is what may be called a qualitative acquaintance with these principles; the quantitative determination of the strains and stresses, and of the precise form and dimensions of each member of the structure, belongs to the profession of architectural engineering, with which the lay student does not need to concern himself. This being so, it is possible to present the bearing of these simple and elementary structural principles upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development of architectural form in a manner at once intelligible and attractive. The student can hardly fail to become interested in observing how differences in building materials and in scientific or material resources have affected the character and aspect of the buildings of different peoples, and how, with the gradual mastery of this or that principle of construction, at first only imperfectly comprehended, architectural styles have progressed in elegance and perfection in proportion as architects, by this growing mastery, have found themselves more and more unhampered in the expression of their artistic conceptions.

Take, for instance, the Roman use of vaulting. The Egyptians and Chaldæans had known and applied the principle of the vault long before the Romans began to use it. By what precise paths it reached Rome is not yet wholly clear; but, however that may be, it is quite unlikely that it would ever have come into wide and general use even among the Romans had it not been for their discovery of the practical uses and convenience of hydraulic cement and concrete. This made it possible for them to build enormously massive walls, piers, and abutments at a very low cost, by means of unskilled labor, such as they could get from slaves or common soldiers. It also rendered possible the construction of huge vaulted roofs and ceilings without the use of cut stone or even of brick, by casting them, as it were, on rough moulds or centrings of timber or earth. The building of vaults led them, furthermore, to make provision for resisting the enormous outward pressure or thrust exerted by all forms of arched construction, and this radically modified the plans of their buildings; while, at the same time, the adoption of vaulted construction, by emancipating them from dependence upon columns for the support of their ceilings, made possible those vast unencumbered interiors which are the greatest glory of Roman architecture, and delivered these noble structures from the danger of destruction by fire.

The Roman system of decoration was, in its main developments, the natural and logical outcome of this constructive system. Thus, while on the one side the history of Roman architecture may be studied in its relation to the historical and intellectual growths and relations of the Roman people, it is seen in another aspect to be a chapter in the history of the growth and development of a particular structural principle, that of vaulting, which was destined finally to culminate in the glorious works of the mediæval cathedral-builders. A like interest, not inferior in kind or degree, attaches to every chapter of the history of man's efforts to build beautifully.

Another department of architectural reading and study which may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well commend itself to the non-professional reader is that which treats of the general principles of design as applied to buildings. This includes the analytical and critical study of the various styles, as distinguished from the study of their historical and chronological development; and it takes up also those considerations, æsthetic and practical, which enter into the composition of every architectural design. Style, expression, scale, proportion, decoration, the relation of structural to æsthetic requirements, and other topics of like nature essential to the critical appreciation of works of architecture constitute the subject-matter of this line of study. It cannot be said to be represented by any very extensive body of literature; but its substance is to be found widely distributed in essays, chapters, or sections in general treatises, and in detached articles in many magazines and reviews. Viollet-le-Duc's "Discourses on Architecture" is an example of this treatment of architecture for lay students. The English have paid more attention to this branch of literature than our own writers; and its bibliography includes several English manuals which are intended for the general public, and which are eminently suggestive and well conceived.

But, when all is said, the most inspiring thing about architecture is its works. One achievement is worth a score of theories. In the average architectural lecture it is the pictures that count. Great buildings, splendid buildings, beautiful buildings seize hold of the imagination; and they stir emotions which the most eloquent discourse would hardly touch. The great monuments of architecture are something more than the mere handiwork of the architect and master-builder. They appeal to the imagination as if endowed with life and personality. They breathe the spirit of the times which saw them rise slowly from their foundations. The air of antiquity clings to them; or, if they belong to more recent times than deserve that venerable title, the contrast which they offer with the work and taste of commonplace modern things still reminds us that they belong to the past, of which they have preserved, as it were, a petrified fragment for our pleasure and instruction. Great buildings have character and expression. They stir our emotions, and each one strikes a different chord.

Even the stay-at-home may, to some extent, share in these sensations. Nothing, indeed, can take the place of the actual buildings or produce the same impression as that which one experiences who stands in their very presence. But it is also true that the art of photography has gone far to make up for the failure to behold a building with one's own eyes, and that to one who has learned to read plans and sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the drawings in a book may convey more information than he could obtain in any cursory visit to the structure represented. There are many advantages, indeed, in the study of buildings by their photographs, and by such other illustrations of them as are obtainable, especially plans and sections. Quite apart from the signal saving in time and expense consequent upon bringing the building into one's room instead of having to journey some hundreds or thousands of miles to reach it, there is the immense convenience of being able to examine in detail, and at one's leisure, every part of a complex edifice, on a reduced scale, and to compare widely separated buildings of the same class or style by actually placing them side by side.

Photographs of all the more important structures treated of in the text-books can be obtained for a very small outlay. In the form of blue-prints and of process-cuts or gelatine-prints in black and white, thousands of subjects are to be had for a cent or two apiece; so that it is easy and not at all expensive to extra-illustrate any architectural history one may be engaged in studying. To study the photographs with the text-book in hand, or the historical or critical treatise with the photographs in hand, is an occupation both instructive and entertaining. One comes thereby to know a building with an intimacy second only to that which results from long and repeated visits to the actual structure.

The study of buildings by photographs is an admirable training in careful observation and scientific analysis. In one of our leading schools of architecture there are systematic exercises in this sort of study. Each student is given a plan or view of some noted edifice to analyze and describe in writing; and each in turn is then required to draw a building from it, whereby an effective test is afforded of the clearness and accuracy of the written description, and hence of the writer's powers of observation and analysis. As the writer is also urged to point out any conspicuous merits or defects which he may discover in the design he describes, the exercise also tends to train and develop the critical faculty. This is a kind of study which is perfectly practicable for any non-professional student of architecture who possesses even the most elementary skill in drawing; while for such as do not care to undertake to make drawings from descriptions, it is possible to turn the descriptions to good profit by comparing them with the photographs upon which they were based, and then with other views of the same edifice from other points.

In view of all these considerations, it is not too much to claim that the study of architecture, although it cannot in itself furnish a complete liberal education, comes nearer to it than does any other course

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of professional training; for it reaches out, on the one hand, to practical scientific and mechanical interests, and, on the other, to abstract and theoretical culture. Architecture is an art, a science, a business, and a profession. It involves training in all these four forms of knowledge and modes of activity in a manner and to an extent that cannot be alleged of any other single pursuit.

As an artist, the architect must study on its æsthetic side every problem presented to him; for architecture means not merely designing buildings, but designing beautiful buildings. This, indeed, is precisely what differentiates it from engineering. But the practical and utilitarian side of his problem cannot be ignored; for stability, salubrity, and convenience are essential to the very existence of buildings. Provision for the meeting of these requirements is a matter of science. The technic of architecture is chiefly scientific. So far as stability and durability are concerned, architecture is merely a special branch of civil engineering, and the training it demands in this direction is a training in exact calculation, and in the application of mathematics to the designing of foundations, arches, vaults, girders, and roof-trusses. Like the civil engineer, the architect must understand, at least in a general way, how to test iron and steel, mortars and cements, and how to tell good materials from bad with unerring judgment. He must have mastered the principles of sanitary engineering, and must be able to solve the most varied problems of plumbing, drainage, heating, and ventilation. All these are accomplishments of a purely scientific character, and demand of the successful practitioner not only training in various sciences, but also the scientific spirit — the ability to consider his problem from the strictly scientific point of view.

In their relations to business, the profession and the training of the architect are not unlike those of the lawyer. He stands before the law as the trusted representative of his client toward the various contractors employed on the building, and controls large expenditures, running sometimes into millions of dollars. If he thus needs to know as much of business as does the lawyer, he must also have at least as much knowledge of the law as the man of business. He must understand those elements of legal science which lie at the foundation of the important business relations which he is obliged to maintain with both his client and the contractors.

The three learned professions of law, medicine, and theology are chiefly distinguished from trade and business by the intellectual character of the education which they presuppose, by the breadth of culture

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which this involves, and by the special relations of trust and confidence in which their practitioners stand toward those who employ them or whom they serve. In these characteristics the architect's place is with the clergyman, the lawyer, and the physician. It is because of the breadth of its intellectual foundations and outlook, and the responsible and intimate personal relation of the architect toward his client, that architecture deserves to rank among the higher professions. The ignorance and dishonesty of individual practitioners no more invalidate this claim than the existence of quacks and charlatans vitiates the high claims of the other professions.

These varied relations give to architectural study an attractiveness which appeals to an exceptionally broad range of tastes and aptitudes. It embraces so many distinct lines of reading and investigation, lends itself to so many diverse points of view, and cultivates withal so catholic a spirit toward departments of knowledge other than those specifically its own, that every seeker after intellectual advancement can find pertinent material somewhere in its broad field. The general reader who seeks from books relaxation or food for mental hunger, outside of his or her special occupation, may open up new avenues of thought and interest by a course of architectural reading.

The materials for such courses have been greatly multiplied in recent years. While the French have for a long time led in the production of both technical works and popular manuals of architecture, they do not now monopolize this field of literature. The number of manuals, text-books, and works of architectural history and criticism in the English language has been greatly augmented of late years. The non-professional reader is no longer confined to Fergusson and Rosengarten for the history, and to Ruskin's "Stones of Venice" and "Seven Lamps" for the criticism, of architecture. Books in our own language, of all degrees of erudition, from the most popular manual to the most serious and technical treatise and the most sumptuous monograph, are now available in all libraries which make any pretensions to completeness. General treatises, dictionaries, encyclopedias, books on special phases and periods of architecture and on special buildings, manuals and histories of the arts allied to architecture, collections of drawings and views of buildings in various lands, publications issued by archæological societies and treating of their researches into the arts of antiquity — these are but part of the resources for architectural information and instruction in English which have been added to our libraries within the last few years.

In these additions American students and writers have borne a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creditable part. Most of the books of American origin have the merit, too often wanting in the writings of Europeans, of freedom from national or racial prejudices; treating the historical development of their subject with perfect impartiality. The majority of these recent works, alike English and American, are reasonably free from technicalities, and recognize fully the needs of the non-professional reader; and not a few among them possess decided literary merit, apart from their excellence as architectural treatises. They have been written to meet a genuine popular demand, and their multiplication and ready sale are evidence of the reality and persistence of this demand.

There are many women among the readers of these books; and, indeed, in this, as in so many other lines of literary and general culture among us, it is the women who are taking the lead. The women's colleges and academies are in advance of those for men in recognizing the place which should be given to the history of art in the curriculum of a general education. In many of them the history of architecture has been given a place equally important with that of painting. Women are clamoring for further opportunities to take up this attractive branch of study at educational centres where it has as yet received no recognition. They have discovered, with a keen and almost intuitive perception of relative values, the intellectual fascination and artistic interest of architecture. They have yielded readily to its attraction; finding that it exacts of them no burdensome and unreasonable amount of technical preparation, and gives large returns in the broadening of intellectual sympathies and appreciations, and in the quickening of æsthetic sensibilities.

The study of architecture by amateurs as a liberal art, not a technical pursuit, is a sure and safe road to a better and broader appreciation of the other arts. It is an excellent foundation on which to build the critical and historical study of the fine arts in general, and an almost equally admirable basis for the study of political and social history. The public libraries and the fireside lend themselves to the pursuit of such studies; and for thousands who have never yet entered this field it holds in store great and lasting delights. The popularizing of architectural reading must make for the improvement of the public taste, and must result, in the long run, in better architecture, both public and private, in the artistic improvement of all public enterprises, in the beautifying of our cities, and in the addition of much charm and delight to all the visible accompaniments of life.

A. D. F. HAMLIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WRITERS IN THE JULY FORUM.

Mr. Champe S. Andrews comes from a family of distinguished lawyers. Is son of Col. Garnett Andrews, the author of "Andrews' Mississippi Digest," and grandson of Judge Garnett Andrews, who was for twenty-four years on the bench of Georgia, and was the author of several legal and political works. Is a first honor graduate of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Alabama. Served during the Spanish-American War as a Captain in the Third Regiment of Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and is now Adjutant of the New York Corps Spanish War Veterans, and a member of the Board of Officers of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War. Frequently served as Judge Advocate of general courts martial. Is a member of the firm of Hill, Stürcke & Andrews, of New York City. This firm is counsel to the Medical Society of the County of New York, incorporated in 1806. Mr. Andrews is counsel to the Medical Society of the State of New York, the recognized organization of the medical profession in this State.

Representative Henry Sherman Boutell was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1856. Was taken West by his parents in 1863. Graduated from Northwestern University in 1874 and from Harvard in 1876. In 1877 received the degree of A.M. from Harvard for post-graduate studies in International Law and Constitutional History. Was admitted to the Illinois bar, and to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1879. Has since practised in Chicago. Was elected a member of the 55th Congress as a Republican from the North Side District of Chicago, and was reëlected to the 56th and the 57th Congresses. Made in the House of Representatives the first argument offered in the first session of the 56th Congress in support of the absolute power of Congress to regulate and dispose of territory acquired by the United States, basing his position upon the historical precedents established by the purchase of Louisiana and the sale of Texas.

Mr. Robert Clark was graduated from Amherst College in 1892. Afterward studied psychology, pedagogy, etc., at the New York School of Pedagogy and at Clark University. Has held positions as tutor, and has taught in public and private schools.

Mr. John Corbin was born in Chicago, in 1870. Graduated at Harvard in 1892, A.M. in 1893. Resided for a year at Balliol College, Oxford. Has been a frequent contributor to various leading publications, and was formerly dramatic critic of "Harper's Weekly" and assistant editor of "Harper's Magazine." Is author of "The Elizabethan Hamlet" and of "Schoolboy Life in England: an American View."

Mr. Alfred Dwight Foster Hamlin was born in 1855, at Constantinople, Turkey, where his father, the late Rev. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, afterward President of Robert College, Constantinople, and later of Middlebury College, Vermont, was then a missionary. Was graduated from Amherst College in 1875, A.M. in 1885. Studied architecture in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, and the *École des Beaux Arts*, Paris, 1876–81. Practised architecture on his return to the United States in 1881. In 1883 was appointed a special assistant to Prof. W. R. Ware in the Department of Architecture at Columbia College, and has ever since been connected with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that institution, now Columbia University. Has been Adjunct Professor since 1891. Is author of "A History of Architecture" (1896), and is a contributor to Sturgis' "Dictionary of Architecture" and many architectural periodicals.

REV. HERBERT W. HORWILL was born at Sandown, England, in 1864. Was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, where he graduated with high honors, including the Chancellor's prize. In 1887 took the M. A. degree at London University, with the gold medal in classics. Is a minister of one of the Methodist churches of England, but for reasons of health retired from full pastoral work in 1896, since which time he has been closely connected with religious journalism in London, both as contributor and as editor. Is now engaged in literary work in New York City. Has published a volume of sermons entitled "The Old Gospel in the New Era."

MR. WALTER MACARTHUR was born at Glasgow, Scotland, in 1862. In 1876 went to sea, and followed that occupation in British and American ships until 1891, in which year he became manager of the "Coast Seamen's Journal," of San Francisco. In 1895 assumed the editorship of that publication. Mr. Macarthur has officiated in a number of important positions in the interest of organized labor in general.

REV. GILBERT REID, D.D., was born on Long Island in 1857. Graduated in 1879 from Hamilton College, and in 1882 from Union Theological Seminary. Commenced missionary work in China the same year in connection with the Presbyterian Church. In 1894 withdrew from the Presbyterian Board, and undertook a new mission among the higher classes, from which has grown the International Institute of China. Dr. Reid is author of "Glances at China," "Reunion of Christendom," and other works.

MR. W. C. JAMESON REID was born in 1872 at Shanghai, where his father was stationed in the service of the English government. After travelling through Europe, he journeyed across Siberia by the caravan route to Peking in 1893. In 1894 took part in an exploring expedition in Eastern Tibet. His later travels have been in British Columbia in 1896, in the Philippines in 1897, in Mexico and Central America in 1898, in Tibet and Siam in 1899, and again in China and the Philippines in 1900. Has published, in addition to many newspaper and magazine articles, two books on Tibet and one on political matters in the East.

MR. JACOB SCHOENHOF was born in Germany in 1839. Came to America in 1861, was naturalized in 1866, and followed a commercial career up to 1885. His experience in trade and manufacturing soon brought him to recognize the antagonism of facts with the generally accepted economic views. As early as 1869 he published in German periodicals his views on the errors of economic theories. President Cleveland appointed him Consul to Tunstall, England, and gave him a commission to inquire into the state of technical education and the economy of production in Europe. Mr. Schoenhof is the author of "Wages and Trade" (1885); "The Economy of High Wages" (1892); "History of Money and Prices" (1896), etc.

PRESIDENT CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING, born at New Sharon, Maine, in 1853, was graduated from Harvard in 1876, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1879. In 1890 became President of Western Reserve University and Adelbert College and allied institutions in Cleveland, Ohio. President Thwing is the author of several works on American colleges and college life.

REPRESENTATIVE OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD was born in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1862. Was educated at the Rugby School, Louisville, and at the University of Virginia. Began law practice at Birmingham, Alabama, in 1884. Was chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the 9th Alabama district in 1892, and has been a member of Congress from that district since 1895.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED